arXiv:1603.05765v1 [math.AG] 18 Mar 2016

Anti-pluricanonical systems on Fano varieties

Caucher Birkar

Abstract. In this paper, we study the linear systems $|-mK_X|$ on Fano varieties X with klt singularities. In a given dimension d, we prove $|-mK_X|$ is non-empty and contains an element with "good singularities" for some number m depending only on d; if in addition X is ϵ-lc for some $\epsilon > 0$, then we show that we can choose m depending only on d and ϵ so that $|-mK_X|$ defines a birational map. Further, we prove Shokurov's conjecture on boundedness of complements, and show that certain classes of Fano varieties form bounded families.

Contents

1. **Introduction** 2
2. **Preliminaries** 6
2.1. Hyperstandard sets 6
2.2. Divisors and morphisms 6
2.3. Pairs 7
2.4. Fano pairs 7
2.6. Generalised polarised pairs 8
2.8. Exceptional and non-exceptional pairs 9
2.9. Complements 10
2.10. Bounded families of pairs 10
2.12. Families of subvarieties 11
2.15. Potentially birational divisors 12
2.16. Non-klt centres 13
2.18. Numerical Kodaira dimension 13
2.20. Pseudo-effective threshold 14
2.22. Volume of divisors 14
2.25. The restriction exact sequence 15
2.27. Descent of nef divisors 15
2.29. Pairs with large boundaries 15
2.31. Divisors with log discrepancy close to 0 16
2.33. Boundary coefficients close to 1 16
3. **Adjunction** 17
3.1. Divisorial adjunction 17
3.4. Adjunction for fibre spaces 19
3.8. Adjunction on non-klt centres 21
3.12. Lifting sections from non-klt centres 24
4. **Effective birationality** 26
4.1. Singularities in bounded families 26
4.3. Effective birationality for Fano varieties with good $\mathbb{Q}$-complements 27

Date: March 21, 2016.
2010 MSC: 14J45, 14E30, 14C20, 14E05.

4.6. Effective birationality for nearly canonical Fano varieties 32
5. **Proof of Theorem 1.4** 34
6. **Boundedness of complements** 37
6.1. General remarks 37
6.2. Hyperstandard coefficients under adjunction for fibre spaces 38
6.4. Pulling back complements from the base of a fibration 40
6.6. Lifting complements from a non-klt centre 41
6.11. Boundedness of complements 48
7. **Boundedness of exceptional pairs** 49
7.1. A directed MMP 49
7.2. Bounds on singularities 50
7.4. From complements to Theorem 1.3 50
7.6. Bound on exceptional thresholds 51
7.8. Bound on anti-canonical volumes 53
7.10. Bound on lc thresholds 53
7.12. From bound on lc thresholds to boundedness of varieties 54
7.14. From complements to Theorem 1.10 55
8. **Boundedness of relative complements** 57
9. **Anti-canonical volume** 59
10. **Proofs of main results** 61
References 62

1. Introduction

We work over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. Given a smooth projective variety W, the minimal model program predicts that W is birational to a projective variety Y with canonical singularities such that either K_Y is ample, or Y admits a fibration whose general fibres X are Calabi-Yau varieties or Fano varieties. In other words, one may say that, birationally, every variety is in some sense constructed from varieties X with good singularities such that either K_X is ample or numerically trivial or anti-ample. So it is quite natural to study such special varieties with the hope of obtaining some sort of classification theory. They are also very interesting in moduli theory, arithmetic geometry, and mathematical physics.

When X is one-dimensional the linear system $|K_X|$ determines its geometry to a large extent. However, in higher dimension, one needs to study $|mK_X|$ or $|-mK_X|$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ (depending on the type of X) in order to investigate the geometry of X. If K_X is ample, then there is m depending only on the dimension such that $|mK_X|$ defines a birational embedding into some projective space, by Hacon-M$^{\rm c}$Kernan [12] and Takayama [39]. If K_X is numerically trivial, there is m such that $|mK_X|$ is non-empty but it is not clear whether we can choose m depending only on the dimension. When K_X is anti-ample, that is when X is Fano, in this paper we study boundedness and singularity properties of the linear systems $|-mK_X|$ in a quite general setting in conjunction with Shokurov's theory of complements.

Effective non-vanishing. Our first result is a consequence of boundedness of complements (1.7 below). We state it separately because it involves little technicalities.

Theorem 1.1. *Let d be a natural number. Then there is a natural number m depending only on d such that if X is any Fano variety of dimension d with klt singularities, then the*

linear system $|-mK_X|$ is non-empty, that is, $h^0(-mK_X) \neq 0$. Moreover, the linear system contains a divisor M such that $(X, \frac{1}{m}M)$ has lc singularities.

Obviously the statement also holds if we replace Fano with the more general notion of weak Fano, that is, if $-K_X$ is nef and big. The theorem was proved by Shokurov in dimension two [37].

Effective birationality for ϵ-lc Fano varieties. If we bound the singularities of X, we then have a much stronger statement than the non-vanishing of 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let d be a natural number and $\epsilon > 0$ a real number. Then there is a natural number m depending only on d and ϵ such that if X is any ϵ-lc weak Fano variety of dimension d, then $|-mK_X|$ defines a birational map.*

Note that m indeed depends on d as well as ϵ because the theorem implies the volume $\mathrm{vol}(-K_X)$ is bounded from below by $\frac{1}{m^d}$. Without the ϵ-lc assumption, $\mathrm{vol}(-K_X)$ can get arbitrarily small or large [14, Example 2.1.1]. In dimension 2, the theorem is a consequence of Alexeev [3], and in dimension 3, special cases are proved by Jiang [19] using different methods.

Boundedness of certain classes of Fano varieties. Fano varieties come in two flavours: *non-exceptional* and *exceptional*. A Fano variety X is non-exceptional if there is $0 \leq P \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X$ such that (X, P) is not klt. Otherwise we say X is exceptional. In the non-exceptional case we can create non-klt centres which sometimes can be used to do induction, i.e. lift sections and complements from such centres (eg, see 6.8 below). We do not have that luxury in the exceptional case. Instead we show that there is a "limited number" of them, that is:

Theorem 1.3. *Let d be a natural number. Then the set of exceptional weak Fano varieties of dimension d forms a bounded family.*

Exceptional pairs and generalised polarised pairs can be defined similarly. We will extend 1.3 to such pairs (see 1.10 below) which is important for our proofs. In a different direction we have:

Theorem 1.4. *Let d be a natural number, and ϵ and δ be positive real numbers. Consider projective varieties X satisfying:*

- *(X, B) is ϵ-lc of dimension d for some boundary B,*
- *B is big and $K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$, and*
- *the coefficients of B are more than or equal to δ.*

Then the set of such X forms a bounded family.

Hacon and Xu proved the theorem assuming the coefficients of B belong to a fixed DCC set of rational numbers [16, Theorem 1.3] relying on the special case when $-K_X$ is ample [14, Corollary 1.7]. The theorem can be viewed as a special case of the following conjecture due to Alexeev and Borisov brothers.

Conjecture 1.5 (BAB)**.** *Let d be a natural number and ϵ a positive real number. Then the set of ϵ-lc Fano varieties X of dimension d forms a bounded family.*

The results and ideas developed in this paper will hopefully lead to an eventual proof of this conjecture. The conjecture is often stated in the log case for pairs (X, B) but it is not hard to reduce it to the above version. The conjecture has been proved in dimension two [3], for smooth X [29], for toric X [9], for threefolds of Picard number one and terminal

singularities [24], for threefolds with canonical singularities [30], in dimension three with K_X having bounded Cartier index [8], and in any dimension with K_X having bounded Cartier index [14, Corollary 1.8].

Next we show 1.5 in lower dimension implies a weak form of 1.5, more precisely:

Theorem 1.6. *Let d be a natural number and ϵ a positive real number. Assume Conjecture 1.5 holds in dimension $d-1$. Then there is a number v depending only on d and ϵ such that if X is an ϵ-lc weak Fano variety of dimension d, then* $\mathrm{vol}(-K_X) \leq v$. *In particular, such X are birationally bounded.*

In dimension 3, the boundedness of $\mathrm{vol}(-K_X)$ was proved by Lai [32] for X of Picard number one and by Jiang [20] in general who also proves the birational boundedness of X in [19] using different methods. Theorem 1.6 gives new proofs of their results since Conjecture 1.5 is known in dimension 2.

Boundedness of complements. Shokurov introduced the theory of complements while investigating threefold log flips [38, §5]. The notion of complement involves both boundedness and singularities of the linear systems $|-mK_X|$. It is actually defined in the more general setting of pairs. See 2.9 for relevant definitions.

The following theorem was conjectured by Shokurov [37, Conjecture 1.3] who proved it in dimension 2 [37, Theorem 1.4] (see also [34, Corollary 1.8], and [38] for some cases).

Theorem 1.7. *Let d be a natural number and $\mathfrak{R} \subset [0,1]$ be a finite set of rational numbers. Then there exists a natural number n divisible by $I(\mathfrak{R})$ and depending only on d and $\mathfrak{R}$ satisfying the following. Assume (X,B) is a projective pair such that*

- *(X,B) is lc of dimension d,*
- *$B \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$, that is, the coefficients of B are in $\Phi(\mathfrak{R})$,*
- *X is Fano type, and*
- *$-(K_X+B)$ is nef.*

Then there is an n-complement K_X+B^+ of K_X+B such that $B^+ \geq B$. Moreover, the complement is also an mn-complement for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, if we let $B = T+\Delta$ where $T = \lfloor B \rfloor$, then the linear system

$$|-nK_X - nT - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor|$$

is not empty.

Here $I(\mathfrak{R})$ denotes the smallest natural number so that $Ir \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $r \in \mathfrak{R}$, and $\Phi(\mathfrak{R})$ is the set of hyperstandard multiplicities associated to $\mathfrak{R}$ (see 2.1). Fano type means (X,G) is klt and $-(K_X+G)$ is ample for some boundary G.

Prokhorov and Shokurov [35][34] prove various inductive statements regarding complements. They [34, Theorem 1.4] also show that 1.7 follows from two conjectures in the same dimension : the BAB conjecture (1.5 above) and the adjunction conjecture for fibre spaces [34, Conjectue 7.13]. In dimension 3, one only needs the BAB [34, Corollary 1.7], and this also can be dropped if in addition we assume (X,B) is non-exceptional.

Both the BAB and the adjunction conjectures are very difficult problems. In this paper we replace the BAB with its special cases 1.3 and 1.4, and we replace the adjunction conjecture with the theory of generalised polarised pairs developed in [7]. See [36] for Shokurov's work on adjunction.

Boundedness of complements in the relative setting. Complements are also defined in the relative setting for a given contraction $X \to Z$ (see 2.9). In particular, when $X \to Z$

is the identity morphism, boundedness of complements is simply a local statement about singularities near a point on X.

Theorem 1.8. *Let d be a natural number and $\mathfrak{R} \subset [0,1]$ be a finite set of rational numbers. Then there exists a natural number n divisible by $I(\mathfrak{R})$ and depending only on d and $\mathfrak{R}$ satisfying the following. Assume (X,B) is a pair and $X \to Z$ a contraction such that*

- *(X,B) is lc of dimension d and $\dim Z > 0$,*
- *$B \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$,*
- *X is Fano type over Z, and*
- *$-(K_X + B)$ is nef over Z.*

Then for any point $z \in Z$, there is an n-complement $K_X + B^+$ of $K_X + B$ over z such that $B^+ \geq B$. Moreover, the complement is also an mn-complement for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

The theorem was proved by Shokurov [37] in dimension 2, and by Prokhorov and Shokurov [35] in dimension 3. They also essentially show that 1.8 in dimension d follows from 1.7 in dimension $d-1$ [35, Theorem 3.1].

Boundedness of complements for generalised polarised pairs. We prove boundedness of complements in the even more general setting of generalised polarised pairs. This is of independent interest but also fundamental to our proofs. It gives enough flexibility for our inductive arguments to go through unlike Theorem 1.7. For the relevant definitions, see 2.6 and 2.9.

Theorem 1.9. *Let d and p be natural numbers and $\mathfrak{R} \subset [0,1]$ be a finite set of rational numbers. Then there exists a natural number n divisible by $pI(\mathfrak{R})$ and depending only on d, p, and $\mathfrak{R}$ satisfying the following. Assume $(X', B' + M')$ is a projective generalised polarised pair with data $\phi\colon X \to X'$ and M such that*

- *$(X', B' + M')$ is generalised lc of dimension d,*
- *$B' \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$ and pM is Cartier,*
- *X' is Fano type, and*
- *$-(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is nef.*

Then there is an n-complement $K_{X'} + B'^+ + M'$ of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$ such that $B'^+ \geq B'$. Moreover, the complement is also an mn-complement for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Generalised polarised pairs behave similar to usual pairs in many ways. For example also see the effective birationality results for polarised pairs of general type established in [7].

Boundedness of exceptional pairs. As mentioned earlier, in order to carry out our inductive arguments we need boundedness of exceptional pairs as in the next result.

Theorem 1.10. *Let d and p be natural numbers and $\mathfrak{R} \subset [0,1]$ be a finite set of rational numbers. Let $(X', B' + M')$ be as in Theorem 1.9 and assume $(X', B' + M')$ is exceptional. Then (X', B') is log bounded.*

About this paper. The main tools used in this paper are the minimal model program [31][6], the theory of complements [35][34][37], creating families of non-klt centres using volumes [14][15][26, §6], and the theory of generalised polarised pairs [7].

We briefly outline the structure of the paper. In Sections 2, we gather some of the tools used in the paper, and prove certain basic results. In Section 3, we discuss various types of

adjunction, recall some known results, and prove some new results (eg, 3.11, 3.13) crucial for later sections. In Section 4, we prove 1.2 under some additional assumptions (4.4, 4.5, 4.7). In Section 5, we prove 1.4. In Section 6, we develop the theory of complements for generalised polarised pairs, and prove various inductive statements (eg, 6.5, 6.8), and discuss behaviour of boundary coefficients under adjunction for fibre spaces (6.3). In Section 7, we study exceptional pairs and treat 1.3 and 1.10 inductively (eg, 7.3, 7.5, 7.9, 7.15). In Section 8, we discuss complements in the relative setting (8.2). In Section 9, we prove 1.6. Finally, in Section 10, we give the proofs of all the main results except those proved earlier.

It is worth mentioning that some of the results stated for varieties only can be easily extended to the log case (eg, 1.2, 1.6) but for simplicity we treat the non-log case only.

Acknowledgements. This work was partially supported by a grant of the Leverhulme Trust. Part of this work was done while visiting National Taiwan University in May and August 2015 with the support of the Mathematics Division (Taipei Office) of the National Center for Theoretical Sciences, and arranged by Jungkai Chen. I would like to thank them for their hospitality. I am indebted to Vyacheslav V. Shokurov for teaching me the theory of complements.

2. Preliminaries

All the varieties in this paper are defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero unless stated otherwise.

2.1. **Hyperstandard sets.** For a subset $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and a number $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $V^{\geq a} = \{v \in V \mid v \geq a\}$. We similarly define $V^{\leq a}, V^{<a}$, and $V^{>a}$.

Let $\mathfrak{R}$ be a subset of $[0,1]$. Following [34, 3.2] we define

$$\Phi(\mathfrak{R}) = \{1 - \frac{r}{m} \mid r \in \mathfrak{R}, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

to be the set of *hyperstandard multiplicities* associated to $\mathfrak{R}$. We usually assume $0, 1 \in \mathfrak{R}$ without mention, so $\Phi(\mathfrak{R})$ includes $\Phi(\{0,1\})$, the set of usual *standard multiplicities*. Note that if we add $1-r$ to $\mathfrak{R}$ for each $r \in \mathfrak{R}$, then we get $\mathfrak{R} \subset \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$.

Now assume $\mathfrak{R} \subset [0,1]$ is a finite set of rational numbers. Then $\Phi(\mathfrak{R})$ is a DCC set of rational numbers whose only accumulation point is 1. Let $I = I(\mathfrak{R})$ be the smallest natural number so that $Ir \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $r \in \mathfrak{R}$. If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is divisible by $I(\mathfrak{R})$, then $nb \leq \lfloor (n+1)b \rfloor$ for every $b \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$ [34, Lemma 3.5].

2.2. **Divisors and morphisms.** Let X be a normal variety, and let M be an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor on X. We often write $H^i(M)$ instead of $H^i(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor M \rfloor))$ and write $|M|$ instead of $|\lfloor M \rfloor|$. We denote the coefficient of a prime divisor D in M by $\mu_D M$. If every non-zero coefficient of M belongs to a set $\Phi \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, we write $M \in \Phi$. Writing $M = \sum m_i M_i$ where M_i are the distinct irreducible components, the notation $M^{\geq a}$ means $\sum_{m_i \geq a} m_i M_i$, that is, we ignore the components with coefficient $< a$. One similarly defines $M^{\leq a}, M^{>a}$, and $M^{<a}$.

Now let $f \colon X \to Z$ be a morphism to a normal variety. We say M is *horizontal* over Z if the induced map $\operatorname{Supp} M \to Z$ is dominant, otherwise we say M is *vertical* over Z. If N is an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on Z, we often denote f^*N by $N|_X$.

Again let $f \colon X \to Z$ be a morphism to a normal variety, and let M and L to be $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisors on X, and $z \in Z$. We say $M \sim L$ over z (resp. $M \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} L$ over z)(resp. $M \sim_{\mathbb{R}} L$ over z) if there is a Cartier (resp. $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier)(resp. $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier) divisor N on Z such that $M - L \sim f^*N$ (resp. $M - L \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*N$)(resp. $M - L \sim_{\mathbb{R}} f^*N$) holds over a neighbourhood of z.

For a birational map $X \dashrightarrow X'$ (resp. $X \dashrightarrow X''$)(resp. $X \dashrightarrow X'''$)(resp. $X \dashrightarrow Y$) whose inverse does not contract divisors, and for an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor M on X we denote the pushdown of M to X' (resp. X'')(resp. X''')(resp. Y) by M' (resp. M'')(resp. M''')(resp. M_Y).

2.3. **Pairs.** In this paper a *sub-pair* (X, B) consists of a normal quasi-projective variety X and an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor B such that $K_X + B$ is $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier. If the coefficients of B are at most 1 we say B is a *sub-boundary*, and if in addition $B \geq 0$, we say B is a *boundary*. A sub-pair (X, B) is called a *pair* if $B \geq 0$ (we allow coefficients of B to be larger than 1 for practical reasons).

Let $\phi\colon W \to X$ be a log resolution of a sub-pair (X, B). Let $K_W + B_W$ be the pulback of $K_X + B$. The *log discrepancy* of a prime divisor D on W with respect to (X, B) is $1 - \mu_D B_W$ and it is denoted by $a(D, X, B)$. We say (X, B) is *sub-lc* (resp. *sub-klt*)(resp. *sub-ϵ-lc*) if every coefficient of B_W is ≤ 1 (resp. < 1)(resp. $\leq 1 - \epsilon$). When (X, B) is a pair we remove the sub and say the pair is lc, etc. Note that if (X, B) is a lc pair, then the coefficients of B necessarily belong to $[0, 1]$.

Let (X, B) be a sub-pair. A *non-klt place* of (X, B) is a prime divisor D on birational models of X such that $a(D, X, B) \leq 0$. A *non-klt centre* is the image on X of a non-klt place. When (X, B) is sub-lc, a non-klt centre is also called a *lc centre*.

2.4. **Fano pairs.** Let (X, B) be a pair and $X \to Z$ a contraction. We say (X, B) is *log Fano* over Z if it is lc and $-(K_X + B)$ is ample over Z; if $B = 0$ we just say X is Fano over Z. The pair is called *weak log Fano* over Z if it is lc and $-(K_X + B)$ is nef and big over Z; if $B = 0$ we say X is *weak Fano* over Z. We say X is *Fano type* over Z if (X, B) is klt weak log Fano over Z for some choice of B; it is easy to see this is equivalent to existence of a big/Z $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary Γ so that (X, Γ) is klt and $K_X + \Gamma \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$.

Assume X is Fano type over Z. Then we can run the MMP over Z on any $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier $\mathbb{R}$-divisor D on X which ends with some model Y [6]. If D_Y is nef over Z, we call Y a *minimal model* over Z for D, but if there is a D_Y-negative extremal contraction $Y \to T/Z$ with $\dim Y > \dim T$, we call Y a *Mori fibre space* over Z for D.

Lemma 2.5. *Let (X, B) be a projective lc pair and $X \to Z$ a contraction onto a smooth curve. Assume X is Fano type over some non-empty open set $U \subseteq Z$. Further assume B is a $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary, $K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$, and that the generic point of each non-klt centre of (X, B) maps into U. Then X is Fano type over Z.*

Proof. There is a big $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary Γ such that over U we have: (X, Γ) is klt and $K_X + \Gamma \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Let (Y, B_Y) be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt model of (X, B). There is a big $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Γ_Y with coefficients ≤ 1 such that its pushdown to X is Γ, and over U, $K_Y + \Gamma_Y$ is the pullback of $K_X + \Gamma$. Replacing Γ with $t\Gamma + (1-t)B$ and replacing Γ_Y with $t\Gamma_Y + (1-t)B_Y$ for some sufficiently small rational number $t > 0$, we can assume Γ_Y is a boundary. In particular, Y is Fano type over U. Now replacing (X, B) with (Y, B_Y) and replacing (X, Γ) with (Y, Γ_Y), we can assume X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial.

Since (X, Γ) is klt over U and since the generic point of every non-klt centre of (X, B) maps into U, replacing Γ with $t\Gamma + (1-t)B$ as above, we can assume (X, Γ) is klt, globally. Running an MMP/Z on $K_X + \Gamma$ terminates with a minimal model X' on which $K_{X'} + \Gamma' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$ because Z is a curve. Let $K_X + \overline{\Gamma}$ be the crepant pullback of $K_{X'} + \Gamma'$. Then $(X, \overline{\Gamma})$ is sub-klt and $K_X + \overline{\Gamma} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$. Note that each component of $\overline{\Gamma}$ with negative coefficient maps outside U. On the other hand, since the generic point of each non-klt centre of (X, B) maps into U, adding to B a small multiple of the fibre over each point in $Z \setminus U$, we can

assume $\operatorname{Supp} B$ contains the union of the support of all such fibres. Thus replacing Γ with $t\Gamma + (1-t)B$ again, we can assume $\overline{\Gamma} \geq 0$. Therefore, X is Fano type over Z. □

2.6. **Generalised polarised pairs.** For the basic theory of generalised polarised pairs see [7, Section 4]. We recall some of the main notions.

(1) A *generalised polarised pair* consists of a normal variety X' equipped with projective morphisms $X \overset{\phi}{\to} X' \to Z$ where ϕ is birational and X is normal, an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor $B' \geq 0$, and an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor M on X which is nef/Z such that $K_{X'} + B' + M'$ is $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier, where $M' := \phi_* M$. We usually refer to the pair by saying $(X', B' + M')$ is a generalised pair with data $X \overset{\phi}{\to} X' \to Z$ and M. Note that if $Y \to X$ is a projective birational morphism from a normal variety, then there is no harm in replacing X with Y and replacing M with its pullback to Y. On the other hand, when Z is not relevant we usually drop it and do not mention it: in this case one can just assume $X' \to Z$ is the identity. When Z is a point we also drop it but say the pair is projective.

Replacing X we can assume ϕ is a log resolution of (X', B'). We can write

$$K_X + B + M = \phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + M')$$

for some uniquely determined B. For a prime divisor D on X the *generalised log discrepancy* $a(D, X', B' + M')$ is $1 - \mu_D B$. A *generalised non-klt centre* is the image of a component of B with coefficient ≥ 1, and the *generalised non-klt locus* is the union of all the generalised non-klt centres.

We say $(X', B' + M')$ is *generalised lc* (resp. *generalised klt*)(resp. *generalised ϵ-lc*) if every coefficient of B is ≤ 1 (resp. < 1)(resp. $\leq 1 - \epsilon$). We say $(X', B' + M')$ is *generalised dlt* if (X', B') is dlt and if every generalised non-klt centre of $(X', B' + M')$ is a non-klt centre of (X', B'). If in addition the connected components of $\lfloor B' \rfloor$ are irreducible, we say the pair is *generalised plt*.

(2) Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a generalised pair as in (1) and let $\psi \colon X'' \to X'$ be a projective birational morphism from a normal variety. Replacing ϕ we can assume ϕ factors through ψ. We then let B'' and M'' be the pushdowns of B and M on X'' respectively. In particular,

$$K_{X''} + B'' + M'' = \psi^*(K_{X'} + B' + M').$$

If $B'' \geq 0$, then $(X'', B'' + M'')$ is also a generalised pair with data $X \to X'' \to Z$ and M. If $(X'', B'' + M'')$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised dlt and if every exceptional prime divisor of ψ appears in B'' with coefficients one, we then say $(X'', B'' + M'')$ is a *$\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised dlt model* of $(X', B' + M')$. Such models exist if $(X', B' + M')$ is generalised lc, by [7, Remark 4.5 (1)].

(3) Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a generalised pair as in (1). Assume that D' on X' is an effective $\mathbb{R}$-divisor and that N on X is an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor which is nef/Z such that $D' + N'$ is $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier where $N' = \phi_* N$. The *generalised lc threshold* of $D' + N'$ with respect to $(X', B' + M')$ is defined as

$$\sup\{s \mid (X', B' + sD' + M' + sN') \text{ is generalised lc}\}$$

where the pair in the definition comes with data $X \overset{\phi}{\to} X' \to Z$ and $M + sN$.

(4) We prove a connectedness principle similar to the usual one.

Lemma 2.7 (Connectedness principle)**.** *Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a generalised pair with data $X \overset{\phi}{\to} X' \to Z$ and M where $X' \to Z$ is a contraction. Assume $-(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is nef and big over Z. Then the generalised non-klt locus of $(X', B' + M')$ is connected near each fibre of $X' \to Z$.*

Proof. We can assume ϕ is a log resolution. Write

$$K_X + B + M = \phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + M').$$

Let X'' be a minimal model of $K_X + M$ over X' which exists by [7, Lemma 4.4]. We write $K_{X''} + B'' + M''$ for the pushdown of $K_X + B + M$. Then B'' is anti-nef/X'. Thus by the negativity lemma, $B'' \geq 0$. The generalised non-klt locus of $(X'', B'' + M'')$ maps onto the generalised non-klt locus of $(X', B' + M')$, hence replacing the latter pair with the former we can assume X' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial.

With the above notation, the generalised non-klt locus of $(X', B'+M')$ is just $\phi(\operatorname{Supp} B^{\geq 1})$. We can write

$$-(K_X + B + M) \sim_{\mathbb{R}} A + C/Z$$

where A is ample and $C \geq 0$. Replacing ϕ we can assume ϕ is a log resolution of $(X', B'+C')$. Pick a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, let $G \sim_{\mathbb{R}} M+\epsilon A/Z$ be general, and let $\Delta = B+\epsilon C+G$. Then $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0/X'$, so $K_X + \Delta = \phi^*(K_{X'} + \Delta')$. Moreover, $\operatorname{Supp} B^{\geq 1} = \operatorname{Supp} \Delta^{\geq 1}$. Thus the non-klt locus of the pair (X', Δ') is equal to the generalised non-klt locus of $(X', B' + M')$. Therefore, the result follows from the usual connected principle [28, Theorem 17.4] because

$$-(K_{X'} + \Delta') \sim_{\mathbb{R}} -(1 - \epsilon)(K_{X'} + B' + M')/Z$$

is nef and big over Z. □

(5) Let $(X', B'+M')$ be a projective generalised klt pair. Assume $A' := -(K_{X'}+B'+M')$ is nef and big. We show X' is Fano type. Using the notation of (1), let $A = \phi^*A'$. Then $A \sim_{\mathbb{R}} H+G$ where H is ample and $G \geq 0$. Take a small $\epsilon > 0$ and a general $C \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \epsilon H + M$. Then

$$K_X + B + \epsilon G + C \sim_{\mathbb{R}} K_X + B + M + \epsilon A = \phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + M' + \epsilon A'),$$

hence if we let $\Delta = B + \epsilon G + C$, then $K_X + \Delta = \phi^*(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ which shows (X', Δ') is klt. Since $-(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ is nef and big, X' is Fano type.

(6) Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a projective generalised lc pair where X' is Fano type and $-(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is nef. Assume $X'' \to X'$ is a birational morphism from a normal projective variety. Let $K_{X''} + B'' + M''$ be the pullback of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$ where B'' is the pushdown of B and M'' is the pushdown of M. We show X'' is Fano type too, assuming every exceptional/X' component of B'' has positive coefficient. There is a $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary Γ' such that (X', Γ') is klt and $-(K_{X'} + \Gamma')$ is nef and big. Let $K_{X''} + \Gamma''$ be the pullback of $K_{X'} + \Gamma'$. Let $\Delta'' = (1 - t)\Gamma'' + tB''$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently close to 1. Then $(X'', \Delta'' + tM'')$ is generalised klt and $-(K_{X''} + \Delta'' + tM')$ is nef and big. Now apply (5).

2.8. **Exceptional and non-exceptional pairs.** (1) Let (X, B) be a projective pair such that $K_X + B + P \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$ for some $\mathbb{R}$ divisor $P \geq 0$. We say the pair is *non-exceptional* (resp. *strongly non-exceptional*) if we can choose P so that $(X, B + P)$ is not klt (resp. not lc). We say the pair is *exceptional* if $(X, B + P)$ is klt for every choice of P.

(2) Now let $(X', B' + M')$ be a projective generalised pair with data $\phi\colon X \to X'$ and M. Assume $K_{X'} + B' + M' + P' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$ for some $\mathbb{R}$-divisor $P' \geq 0$. We say the pair is *non-exceptional* (resp. *strongly non-exceptional*) if we can choose P' so that $(X', B' + P' + M')$ is not generalised klt (resp. not generalised lc). We say the pair is *exceptional* if $(X', B' + P' + M')$ is generalised klt for every choice of P'. Here we consider $(X', B' + P' + M')$ as a generalised pair with data $\phi\colon X \to X'$ and M.

2.9. **Complements.** (1) We first recall the definition for usual pairs. Let (X, B) be a pair where B is a boundary and let $X \to Z$ be a contraction. Let $T = \lfloor B \rfloor$ and $\Delta = B - T$. An *n-complement* of $K_X + B$ over a point $z \in Z$ is of the form $K_X + B^+$ where

- (X, B^+) is lc,
- $n(K_X + B^+) \sim 0$ holds over some neighbourhood of z, and
- $nB^+ \geq nT + \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor$ holds over some neighbourhood of z.

From the definition one sees that

$$-nK_X - nT - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor \sim nB^+ - nT - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor \geq 0$$

over some neighbourhood of z which in particular means the linear system

$$|-nK_X - nT - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor|$$

is not empty over z.

(2) Now let $(X', B' + M')$ be a projective generalised pair with data $\phi\colon X \to X'$ and M where $B' \in [0, 1]$. Let $T' = \lfloor B' \rfloor$ and $\Delta' = B' - T'$. An *n-complement* of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$ is of the form $K_{X'} + B'^+ + M'$ where

- $(X', B'^+ + M')$ is generalised lc,
- $n(K_{X'} + B'^+ + M') \sim 0$ and nM is Cartier, and
- $nB'^+ \geq nT' + \lfloor (n+1)\Delta' \rfloor$.

From the definition one sees that

$$-nK_{X'} - nT' - \left\lfloor (n+1)\Delta' \right\rfloor - nM' \sim nB'^+ - nT' - \left\lfloor (n+1)\Delta' \right\rfloor \geq 0$$

which in particular means the linear system

$$|-nK_{X'} - nT' - \left\lfloor (n+1)\Delta' \right\rfloor - nM'|$$

is not empty. We can also define complements for generalised pairs in the relative setting but for simplicity we will not deal with those.

2.10. **Bounded families of pairs.** A *couple* (X, D) consists of a normal projective variety X and a divisor D on X whose coefficients are all equal to 1, i.e. D is a reduced divisor. The reason we call (X, D) a couple rather than a pair is that we are concerned with D rather than $K_X + D$ and we do not want to assume $K_X + D$ to be $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier or with nice singularities.

We say that a set $\mathcal{P}$ of couples is *birationally bounded* if there exist finitely many projective morphisms $V^i \to T^i$ of varieties and reduced divisors C^i on V^i such that for each $(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}$ there exist an i, a closed point $t \in T^i$, and a birational isomorphism $\phi\colon V^i_t \dashrightarrow X$ such that (V^i_t, C^i_t) is a couple and $E \leq C^i_t$ where V^i_t and C^i_t are the fibres over t of the morphisms $V^i \to T^i$ and $C^i \to T^i$ respectively, and E is the sum of the birational transform of D and the reduced exceptional divisor of ϕ. We say $\mathcal{P}$ is *bounded* if we can choose ϕ to be an isomorphism.

A set $\mathcal{R}$ of projective pairs (X, B) is said to be *log birationally bounded* (respectively *log bounded*) if the set of the corresponding couples $(X, \operatorname{Supp} B)$ is birationally bounded (respectively bounded). Note that this does not put any condition on the coefficients of B, eg we are not requiring the coefficients of B to be in a finite set. If $B = 0$ for all the $(X, B) \in \mathcal{R}$ we usually remove the log and just say the set is birationally bounded (resp. bounded).

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a bounded set of couples and $e \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$. Then there is a finite set $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ depending only on $\mathcal{P}$ and e satisfying the following. Let $(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}$ and assume $R \geq 0$ is a non-zero integral divisor on X such that $K_X + D + rR \equiv 0$ for some real number $r \geq e$. Then $r \in I$.*

Proof. We can choose an effective very ample Cartier divisor A on X such that $(X, A + D)$ belongs to a bounded set of couples $\mathcal{Q}$ depending only on $\mathcal{P}$. Moreover, realising A^{d-1} as a 1-cycle inside the smooth locus of X, the intersection number $L \cdot A^{d-1}$ makes sense and is an integer for any integral divisor L. On the other hand, by the boundedness assumption, $(K_X + D) \cdot A^{d-1}$ belongs to some finite set depending only on $\mathcal{P}$. Thus from

$$(K_X + D + rR) \cdot A^{d-1} = 0$$

and the assumption $r \geq e$ we deduce that $R \cdot A^{d-1}$ is bounded from above, hence r belongs to some finite set I depending only on $\mathcal{P}$ and e. □

2.12. **Families of subvarieties.** Let X be a normal projective variety. A *bounded family $\mathcal{G}$ of subvarieties* of X is a family of (closed) subvarieties such that there are finitely many morphisms $V^i \to T^i$ of projective varieties together with morphisms $V^i \to X$ such that $V^i \to X$ embeds in X the fibres of $V^i \to T^i$ over closed points, and each member of the family $\mathcal{G}$ is isomorphic to a fibre of some $V^i \to T^i$ over some closed point. Note that we can replace the $V^i \to T^i$ so that we can assume the set of points of T^i corresponding to members of $\mathcal{G}$ is dense in T^i. We say the family $\mathcal{G}$ is a *covering family of subvarieties* of X if the union of its members contains some non-empty open subset of X. In particular, this means $V^i \to X$ is surjective for at least one i. When we say G is a *general member of $\mathcal{G}$* we mean there is i such that $V^i \to X$ is surjective, the set A of points of T^i corresponding to members of $\mathcal{G}$ is dense in T^i, and G is the fibre of $V^i \to T^i$ over a general point of A (in particular, G is among the general fibres of $V^i \to T^i$).

Note that our definition of a bounded family here is compatible with 2.10. Indeed assume $\mathcal{G}$ is a family of subvarieties of X which is bounded according to the definition in 2.10. Then there are finitely many possible Hilbert polynomials (with respect to a fixed ample divisor on X) of the members of the family. Consider the Hilbert scheme H of X and take the universal family $\mathcal{H} \to H$. There are closed subvarieties T^i of H and irreducible components V^i of the reduction of $\mathcal{V}^i$, where $\mathcal{V}^i = T^i \times_H \mathcal{H} \to T^i$ is the induced family, so that each $G \in \mathcal{G}$ is isomorphic to a fibre of $V^i \to T^i$ over some closed point. By choosing the T^i carefully, we can assume that, for each i, the members of $\mathcal{G}$ correspond to a dense set of fibres of $V^i \to T^i$. Since we obtained $V^i \to T^i$ from the Hilbert scheme, we have an induced morphism $V^i \to X$ which embeds in X the fibres of $V^i \to T^i$ over closed points. Therefore, $\mathcal{G}$ is a bounded family of subvarieties according to the definition in the last paragraph.

The next lemma is useful in applications when we want to replace $V^i \to T^i$ so that $V^i \to X$ becomes generically finite (eg, see the proof of 3.11).

Lemma 2.13. *Let $f\colon V \to T$ be a contraction between smooth projective varieties and $g\colon V \to X$ a surjective morphism to a normal projective variety. Let t be a closed point of T and F the fibre of f over t. Further assume*

(1) *the induced map $F \to X$ is birational onto its image,*

(2) *f is smooth over t,*

(3) *g is smooth over $g(\eta_F)$, and $g(\eta_F)$ is a smooth point of X where η_F is the generic point of F.*

Let S be a general hypersurface section of sufficiently large degree passing through t, let $U = f^*S$, and assume $U \to X$ is surjective. Then U and S are smooth, $U \to S$ is smooth over t, and $U \to X$ is smooth over $g(\eta_F)$.

Proof. Let v be a general closed point of F, and let G be the fibre of g over $x := g(v)$. The scheme-theoretic intersection $F \cap G$ is the fibre of $F \to X$ over x, hence it is the reduced point $\{v\}$, by (1). In particular, $\mathcal{T}_{F,v} \cap \mathcal{T}_{G,v} = \{v\}$ where $\mathcal{T}_{F,v}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{G,v}$ are the tangent spaces to F and G at v. On the other hand, $F \cap G$ is also the fibre of the induced morphism $G \to T$ over t, so the fibre is again just $\{v\}$. Now since f is smooth over t, we have an exact sequence of tangent spaces

$$0 \to \mathcal{T}_{F,v} \to \mathcal{T}_{V,v} \to \mathcal{T}_{T,t} \to 0.$$

Thus the kernel of the map $\mathcal{T}_{G,v} \to \mathcal{T}_{T,t}$ is $\mathcal{T}_{F,v} \cap \mathcal{T}_{G,v}$, hence $\mathcal{T}_{G,v} \to \mathcal{T}_{T,t}$ is injective. Therefore, $G \to T$ is a closed immersion near v, by Lemma 2.14 below.

Since S is a general hypersurface section of sufficiently large degree passing through t and since T is smooth, S is smooth too. Moreover, since G is smooth by (3), $S|_G$ is smooth as well: indeed $S|_G$ is smooth outside v by [17, Chapter III, Remark 10.9.2] and also smooth at v as G is smooth and $G \to T$ is a closed immersion near v.

By construction, $U \to S$ is smooth over t, and U is a smooth variety outside F. Moreover, U is smooth at every point of F as F is the fibre of $U \to S$ over t which is smooth and $t \in S$ is smooth. Therefore, U is smooth.

Since g is smooth near G, $\dim G = \dim V - \dim X$. So

$$\dim U \cap G = \dim G - 1 = \dim V - \dim X - 1 = \dim U - \dim X$$

where we think of the scheme-theoretic intersection $U \cap G$ as the fibre of $U \to X$ over x. Thus $U \to X$ is flat over x by [17, Chapter III, Exercise 10.9] which in turn implies $U \to X$ is smooth over x [17, Chapter III, Exercise 10.2] as $U \cap G = U|_G = S|_G$ is smooth. Therefore, $U \to X$ is smooth over $g(\eta_F)$.

□

Lemma 2.14. *Let $h\colon X \to Z$ be a projective morphism of normal varieties, $x \in X$ be a closed point, and $z = h(x)$. Assume $h^{-1}\{z\} = \{x\}$, and assume the map on tangent spaces $\mathcal{T}_{X,x} \to \mathcal{T}_{Z,z}$ is injective. Then h is a closed immersion near x.*

Proof. Since $h^{-1}\{z\} = \{x\}$, by considering the Stein factorisation of h, we can see that h is a finite morphism over z. Thus shrinking X, Z we can assume h is finite. Using $h^{-1}\{z\} = \{x\}$ once more, we deduce that every open neighbourhood of x in X contains the inverse image under h of some open neighbourhood of z in Z. This implies the map on stalks $(h_*\mathcal{O}_X)_z \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is an isomorphism. Thus $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a finitely generated $\mathcal{O}_{Z,z}$-module as $h_*\mathcal{O}_X$ is coherent.

On the other hand, since the map $\mathcal{T}_{X,x} \to \mathcal{T}_{Z,z}$ is injective, the dual map $m_z/m_z^2 \to m_x/m_x^2$ is surjective where m_z and m_x are the maximal ideals of $\mathcal{O}_{Z,z}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. Now apply [17, II, Lemma 7.4] to show the homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{Z,z} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is surjective which implies $\mathcal{O}_Z \to h_*\mathcal{O}_X$ is surjective near z. Therefore, h is a closed immersion near x since h is finite. □

2.15. **Potentially birational divisors.** Let X be a normal projective variety, and let D be a big $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X. We say that D is *potentially birational* [14, Definition 3.5.3] if for any pair x and y of general closed points of X, possibly switching x and y, we can find $0 \leq \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (1-\epsilon)D$ for some $0 < \epsilon < 1$ such that (X, Δ) is not klt at y but (X, Δ) is lc at x and $\{x\}$ is a non-klt centre.

If D is potentially birational, then $|K_X + \lceil D \rceil|$ defines a birational map [15, Lemma 2.3.4].

2.16. **Non-klt centres.** (1) The next statement is a variant of [14, Lemma 3.2.3].

Lemma 2.17. *Let (X, B) be a projective pair where B is a $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary, and let $D \geq 0$ be a big $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor. Let $x, y \in X$ be closed points, and assume (X, B) is klt near x, $(X, B + D)$ is lc near x with a unique non-klt centre G containing x, and $(X, B + D)$ is not lc near y. Then there exist rational numbers $0 \leq t \ll s \leq 1$ and a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $0 \leq D' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D$ such that $(X, B + sD + tD')$ is not lc near y but it is lc near x with a unique non-klt place whose centre contains x, and the centre of this non-klt place is G.*

Proof. Let $\phi\colon W \to X$ be a log resolution. Then $\phi^*D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A + C$ where $A \geq 0$ is ample and general, and $C \geq 0$. Let $C' = \phi_*C$ and $D' = \phi_*(A + C)$. We can assume ϕ is a log resolution of $(X, B + D + D')$. Write

$$K_W + \Gamma_{s,t} = \phi^*(K_X + B + sD + tD').$$

Let T be the sum of the components of $\left\lfloor \Gamma^{\geq 0}_{1,0} \right\rfloor$ whose image contains x. By assumption, $\phi(S) = G$ for every component S of T. Now pick $t > 0$ sufficiently small and let s be the lc threshold of D with respect to $(X, B + tD')$ near x. Then s is sufficiently close to 1. Moreover, $\left\lfloor \Gamma^{\geq 0}_{s,t} \right\rfloor \subseteq \left\lfloor \Gamma^{\geq 0}_{1,t} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \Gamma^{\geq 0}_{1,0} \right\rfloor$, so any component of $\left\lfloor \Gamma^{\geq 0}_{s,t} \right\rfloor$ whose image contains x, is a component of T. Now possibly after perturbing the coefficients of C and replacing A, we can assume $\left\lfloor \Gamma^{\geq 0}_{s,t} \right\rfloor$ has only one component S such that $x \in \phi(S)$. Since S is a component of T, we have $\phi(S) = G$. □

(2) Let X be a normal projective variety of dimension d and D an ample $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor. Assume $\mathrm{vol}(D) > (2d)^d$. Then there is a bounded family of subvarieties of X such that for each pair $x, y \in X$ of general closed points, there is a member G of the family and there is $0 \leq \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D$ such that (X, Δ) is lc near x with a unique non-klt place whose centre contains x, that centre is G, and (X, Δ) is not lc at y [14, Lemma 7.1].

Now assume A is an ample and effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor. Pick a pair $x, y \in X$ of general closed points and let Δ and G be as above chosen for x, y. If $\dim G = 0$, or if $\dim G > 0$ and $\mathrm{vol}(A|_G) \leq d^d$, then we let $G' := G$ and let $\Delta' := \Delta + A$. On the other hand, if $\dim G > 0$ and $\mathrm{vol}(A|_G) > d^d$, then there is $0 \leq \Delta' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \Delta + A$ and there is a proper subvariety $G' \subset G$ such that (X, Δ') is lc near x with a unique non-klt place whose centre contains x, that centre is G', and (X, Δ') is not lc at y, by [26, Theorem 6.8.1 and 6.8.1.3] and by Lemma 2.17. Repeating this process $d - 1$ times, we find $0 \leq \Delta^{(d-1)} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D + (d-1)A$ and a proper subvariety $G^{(d-1)} \subset G$ such that $(X, \Delta^{(d-1)})$ is lc near x with a unique non-klt place whose centre contains x, that centre is $G^{(d-1)}$, $(X, \Delta^{(d-1)})$ is not lc at y, and either $\dim G^{(d-1)} = 0$ or $\mathrm{vol}(A|_{G^{(d-1)}}) \leq d^d$. In particular, all such centres $G^{(d-1)}$ form a bounded family of subvarieties of X.

2.18. **Numerical Kodaira dimension.** For an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor D on a normal projective variety X, we denote the *numerical Kodaira dimension* of D by $\kappa_\sigma(D)$, as defined in [33]. If D is pseudo-effective, a decomposition $D = P_\sigma(D) + N_\sigma(D)$ is defined in [33] where $N_\sigma(D) \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.19. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a bounded set of smooth projective varieties X with $\kappa_\sigma(K_X) = 0$. Then there is a number $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h^0(lK_X) \neq 0$ for every $X \in \mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. Perhaps after replacing $\mathcal{P}$, we can assume there is a smooth projective morphism $f\colon V \to T$ of smooth varieties such that every $X \in \mathcal{P}$ appears as a fibre of f over some closed point. Then by [15, Theorem 1.8 (2)], $\kappa_\sigma(K_F) = 0$ for every fibre F of f. Applying [11] to the geometric generic fibre and applying semi-continuity of cohomology shows that there is $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h^0(lK_F) \neq 0$ for every fibre F. □

2.20. **Pseudo-effective threshold.**

Lemma 2.21. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a log bounded set of log smooth projective pairs (X, B). Then there is a number $\lambda > 0$ such that if $(X, B) \in \mathcal{P}$ and if K_X is not pseudo-effective, then $K_X + \lambda B$ is not pseudo-effective.*

Proof. Perhaps after replacing $\mathcal{P}$, we can assume there exist a smooth projective morphism $f\colon V \to T$ of smooth varieties and a reduced divisor S on V, which is simple normal crossing over T, such that if $(X, B) \in \mathcal{P}$, then X is a fibre of f over some closed point and $\operatorname{Supp} B$ is inside the restriction of S to X. Replacing B, we can assume $B = S|_X$. Now apply [15, Theorem 1.8 (2)]. □

2.22. **Volume of divisors.** Recall that the volume of an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor D on a normal projective variety X of dimension d is defined as

$$\operatorname{vol}(D) = \limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{h^0(\lfloor mD \rfloor)}{m^d/d!}.$$

Lemma 2.23. *Let X be a normal projective variety of dimension d, D an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier $\mathbb{R}$-divisor with $\kappa_\sigma(D) > 0$, and A an ample $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor. Then $\lim_{m\to\infty} \operatorname{vol}(mD + A) = \infty$.*

Proof. Replacing X with a resolution and replacing A appropriately, we can assume X is smooth. Replacing D with $P_\sigma(D)$, we can assume $N_\sigma(D) = 0$. Let C be a curve cut out by general members of $|A|$. By [33, Chapter V, Theorem 1.3], perhaps after replacing A with a multiple, we can assume C does not intersect $\operatorname{Bs}|\lfloor mD \rfloor + A|$ for any $m > 0$. In particular, for each m, there is a resolution $\phi\colon W \to X$ such that $\phi^*(\lfloor mD \rfloor + A)$ decomposes as the sum of a free divisor F and fixed part G such that $\operatorname{Supp} G$ does not intersect $\phi^{-1}C$. Then

$$\operatorname{vol}(mD + 2A) \geq \operatorname{vol}(\lfloor mD \rfloor + 2A) = \operatorname{vol}(\phi^*(\lfloor mD \rfloor + 2A)) \geq$$

$$\operatorname{vol}(F + \phi^*A)) \geq F \cdot (\phi^*A)^{d-1} = \phi^*(\lfloor mD \rfloor + A) \cdot (\phi^*A)^{d-1} = (\lfloor mD \rfloor + A) \cdot C.$$

Since $(\lfloor mD \rfloor + A) \cdot C$ is not a bounded function of m, $\operatorname{vol}(mD + 2A)$ is not bounded, hence $\lim_{m\to\infty} \operatorname{vol}(2mD + 2A) = \infty$ which implies the lemma.

□

Lemma 2.24. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a set of pairs (X, A) where X is smooth projective of dimension $\leq d$ with $\kappa_\sigma(K_X) > 0$, and A is big and base point free. Then for each number q, there is a number p such that for every $(X, A) \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $\operatorname{vol}(pK_X + A) > q$.*

Proof. If the statement is not true, then there exist a number $q \in \mathbb{N}$, a strictly increasing sequence of numbers $p_i \in \mathbb{N}$, and a sequence of pairs $(X_i, A_i) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\operatorname{vol}(p_iK_{X_i} + A_i) \leq q$ for every i. Since A is base point free, we may assume A is irreducible. Let $X_i \to Z_i$ be the contraction defined by $|A_i|$ and let C_i be the pushdown of A_i. Since $\operatorname{vol}(A_i) \leq q$, the couples (Z_i, C_i) form a log bounded family. Replacing X_i with an appropriate resolution of Z_i and replacing A_i accordingly, we can assume (X_i, A_i) is log smooth and log bounded. Replacing the sequence, we can assume there is a projective morphism $f\colon V \to T$ of smooth varieties and a reduced divisor $A \geq 0$ on V which is simple normal crossing over T and such that for each i, X_i appears as a general fibre of f over some closed point and that $A_i = A|_{X_i}$.

Fix a general fibre F of f and let $A_F = A|_F$. Then by [15, Theorem 1.8 (3)], for each i,

$$\mathrm{vol}(K_F + \frac{1}{p_i}A_F) = \mathrm{vol}(K_{X_i} + \frac{1}{p_i}A_i),$$

hence

$$\mathrm{vol}(p_iK_F + A_F) = \mathrm{vol}(p_iK_{X_i} + A_i) \leq q.$$

Pick l so that $lA_F \sim H_F + L_F$ where H_F is ample and L_F is big. Then $\mathrm{vol}(lp_iK_F + H_F) \leq l^d q$. This contradicts Lemma 2.23. □

2.25. **The restriction exact sequence.** Let X be a normal projective variety, S a normal prime divisor and L an integral $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on X. We have an exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_X(L - S) \to \mathcal{O}_X(L) \to \mathcal{F} \to 0$$

where $\mathcal{F}$ is an $\mathcal{O}_S$-module.

Lemma 2.26. *Assume (X, B) is dlt for some boundary B. Let U be the largest open subset of X on which L is Cartier. If the codimension of the complement of $S \cap U$ in S is at least two, then $\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{O}_S(L|_S)$.*

Proof. Note that $L|_S$ is well-defined up to linear equivalence. Let A be an ample Cartier divisor on X. Since (X, B) is dlt, by duality [31, Corollary 5.27] and Serre vanishing, $h^i(L - nA) = 0$ and $h^i(L - S - nA) = 0$ for any $i < d = \dim X$ and any $n \gg 0$. Thus $h^i(\mathcal{F}(-nA)) = 0$ for $i < d - 1$ and any $n \gg 0$. This implies $\mathcal{F}$ is a Cohen-Macaulay sheaf on S [31, Corollary 5.72]. In particular, $\mathcal{F}$ is S_2, hence $\mathcal{F}$ is determined by $\mathcal{F}|_{U\cap S}$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{O}_S(L|_S)$ is reflexive, hence it is determined by its restriction to $S \cap U$. Now the result follows from the fact that on $S \cap U$, $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{O}_S(L|_S)$ are isomorphic. □

2.27. **Descent of nef divisors.**

Lemma 2.28. *Let $f\colon X \to Z$ be a contraction from a smooth projective variety to a normal projective variety with rationally connected general fibres. Assume M is a nef Cartier divisor on X such that $M \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ on the generic fibre of f. Then there exist resolutions $\phi\colon W \to X$ and $\psi\colon V \to Z$ such that the induced map $W \dashrightarrow V$ is a morphism and $\phi^*M \sim 0/V$.*

Proof. Since M is nef and $M \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ on the generic fibre of f, we can find ϕ and ψ so that $\phi^*M \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/V$ [25, Proposition 2.1]. Replacing X with W and replacing Z with V, we can assume $M \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$. Since the general fibres of f are rationally connected, K_X is not pseudo-effective over Z. Running an MMP$/Z$ on K_X with scaling of some ample divisor as in [6], we get a Mori fibre space $X' \to T'/Z$. Since M is Cartier and $M \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$, M' is Cartier, by the cone theorem [31, Theorem 3.7], where M' is the pushdown of M. Moreover, $M' \sim 0/T'$ again by [31, Theorem 3.7], hence M' is the pullback of some nef Cartier divisor N' on T'. Let T be a resolution of T'. Then the general fibres of $T \to Z$ are rationally connected as they are dominated by the general fibres of f. Now replace X with T and replace M with the pullback of N' to T. Then apply induction on dimension.

□

2.29. **Pairs with large boundaries.**

Lemma 2.30. *Let (X, B) be a projective klt pair of dimension d, and let M be a nef Cartier divisor. Let $a > 2d$ be a real number. Then any MMP on $K_X + B + aM$ is M-trivial, i.e. the extremal rays in the process intersect M trivially. If M is big, then $K_X + B + aM$ is also big.*

Proof. The fact that any MMP on $K_X + B + aM$ is M-trivial follows from boundedness of extremal rays [23]. The Cartier condition of M is preserved in the process by the cone theorem. Now assume M is big. Then we can run an MMP which terminates with some model [6]. Since M is big, the MMP ends with a minimal model otherwise we get a Mori fibre space $Y \to T$ and by boundedness of extremal rays, $M_Y \equiv 0/T$ which is not possible. Replacing X with the minimal model, we can assume $K_X + B + aM$ is nef. Then $K_X + B + a'M$ is nef for any $a' < a$ sufficiently close to a otherwise there is an extremal ray R such that $(K_X + B + aM) \cdot R = 0$ and $M \cdot R > 0$ which contradicts boundedness of extremal rays. Therefore, $K_X + B + aM$ is big.

□

2.31. **Divisors with log discrepancy close to** 0**.**

Lemma 2.32. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Phi \subset [0,1]$ be a DCC set. Then there is $\epsilon > 0$ depending only on d and Φ such that if (X, B) is a projective pair and D is a prime divisor on birational models of X satisfying*

- *(X, B) is lc of dimension d and $(X, 0)$ is klt,*
- *$K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$ and $B \in \Phi$, and*
- *$a(D, X, B) < \epsilon$,*

then $a(D, X, B) = 0$.

Proof. If the lemma does not hold, then there exist a decreasing sequence ϵ_i of numbers approaching 0 and a sequence $(X_i, B_i), D_i$ of pairs and divisors as in the statement such that $0 < a(D_i, X_i, B_i) < \epsilon_i$. Since $(X_i, 0)$ is klt, there is a birational morphism $X_i' \to X_i$ extracting only D_i. Let $K_{X_i'} + B_i'$ be the pullback of $K_{X_i} + B_i$, and let $b_i = 1 - a(D_i, X_i, B_i)$ which is the coefficient of D_i in B_i'. Note that $B_i' \in \Phi' := \Phi \cup \{b_i\}$. Replacing the sequence, we can assume Φ' is a DCC set. Now we get a contradiction, by [14, Theorem 1.5], because $\{b_i\}$ is not finite. □

2.33. **Boundary coefficients close to** 1**.** Let $d, p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$, and let $\Phi \subset [0,1]$ be a DCC set. Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a projective generalised pair of dimension d with data $\phi\colon X \to X'$ and M such that $B' \in \Phi \cup (1-\epsilon, 1]$, pM is Cartier, $-(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is a limit of movable $\mathbb{R}$-divisors, and there is $0 \le P' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} -(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ such that $(X', B' + P' + M')$ is generalised lc. Assume X' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial Fano type. Let Θ' be the boundary whose coefficients are the same as B' except that we replace each coefficient in $(1-\epsilon, 1)$ with 1. That is, $\Theta' = (B')^{\le 1-\epsilon} + \lceil (B')^{>1-\epsilon} \rceil$.

Assuming ϵ is sufficiently small, depending only on d, p, Φ, we will prove the following. Run an MMP on $-(K_{X'} + \Theta' + M')$ and let X'' be the resulting model. Then:

(1) $(X', \Theta' + M')$ is generalised lc,
(2) the MMP does not contract any component of $\lfloor \Theta' \rfloor$,
(3) $-(K_{X''} + \Theta'' + M'')$ is nef, and
(4) $(X'', \Theta'' + M'')$ is generalised lc.

Proof of (1). Assume it is not true. Then there exist a decreasing sequence ϵ_i of numbers approaching 0, and a sequence $(X_i', B_i' + M_i')$ of generalised pairs as above such that if Θ_i' is the divisor derived from B_i' using ϵ_i, then $(X_i', \Theta_i' + M_i')$ is not generalised lc. There exist boundaries $B_i' \le \Gamma_i' \le \Theta_i'$ with $\Gamma_i' \in \Phi \cup (1-\epsilon_i, 1]$ and a component D_i' of Γ_i' with coefficient $t_i \in (1-\epsilon_i, 1)$ such that t_i is the generalised lc threshold of D_i' with respect to $(X_i', \Gamma_i' - t_i D_i' + M_i')$. Replacing the sequence we can assume the union of the coefficients of all the Γ_i' is a DCC set. Then we get a contradiction by the ACC for generalised lc

thresholds [7, Theorem 1.4].

Proof of (2). If this is not true, then there exist a decreasing sequence ϵ_i of numbers approaching 0, and a sequence $(X'_i, B'_i + M'_i)$ of generalised pairs as above such that if Θ'_i is the divisor derived from B'_i using ϵ_i, then the MMP contracts some component S'_i of $\lfloor \Theta'_i \rfloor$. Since all our assumptions are preserved under the MMP, we may assume the first step of the MMP is a birational contraction $X'_i \to \tilde{X}'_i$ which contracts S'_i. Let R'_i be the corresponding extremal ray.

As $-(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is a limit of movable $\mathbb{R}$-divisors, $-(K_{X'_i} + B'_i + M'_i) \cdot R'_i \geq 0$. Moreover, $S'_i \cdot R'_i < 0$ and if $\bar{B}'_i$ is the same as B'_i except that we increase the coefficient of S'_i to 1, then $B'_i \leq \bar{B}'_i \leq \Theta'_i$ and $-(K_{X'_i} + \bar{B}'_i + M'_i) \cdot R'_i \geq 0$. Therefore, there exist boundaries $B'_i \leq \Gamma'_i \lneq \Theta'_i$ with $\Gamma'_i \in \Phi \cup (1 - \epsilon_i, 1]$ such that $-(K_{X'_i} + \Gamma'_i + M'_i) \cdot R'_i = 0$ and S'_i is a component of $\lfloor \Gamma'_i \rfloor$. Moreover, there is a component D'_i of Γ'_i with coefficient $t_i \in (1 - \epsilon_i, 1)$ such that $D'_i \cdot R'_i > 0$. Now t_i is the generalised lc threshold of $\tilde{D}'_i$ with respect to $(\tilde{X}'_i, \tilde{\Gamma}'_i - t_i \tilde{D}'_i + \tilde{M}'_i)$ where $\tilde{\Gamma}'_i, \tilde{D}'_i, \tilde{M}'_i$ are the pushdowns of Γ'_i, D'_i, M'_i. Again this contradicts [7, Theorem 1.4].

Proof of (3). Assume this is not true. Then there exist a decreasing sequence ϵ_i of numbers approaching 0, and a sequence $(X'_i, B'_i + M'_i)$ of generalised pairs as above such that if Θ'_i is the divisor derived from B'_i using ϵ_i, then the MMP gives an extremal non-birational contraction $X''_i \to T''_i$ which is $-(K_{X''_i} + \Theta''_i + M''_i)$-negative. Under our assumptions $-(K_{X'_i} + B'_i + M'_i)$ is nef over T''_i. So there exist boundaries $B'_i \leq \Gamma'_i \lneq \Theta'_i$ with $\Gamma'_i \in \Phi \cup (1 - \epsilon_i, 1]$ such that $-(K_{X''_i} + \Gamma''_i + M''_i) \equiv 0/T''_i$. Moreover, there is a component D'_i of Γ'_i with coefficient $t_i \in (1 - \epsilon_i, 1)$ such that D'_i is ample over T''_i. By restricting to the general fibres of $X''_i \to T''_i$ we get a contradiction in view of the global ACC for generalised pairs [7, Theorem 1.5].

Proof of (4). This can be proved as in (1).

3. **Adjunction**

In this section we discuss various kinds of adjunction that would be needed in subsequent sections.

3.1. **Divisorial adjunction.** Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a generalised pair with data $X \overset{\phi}{\to} X'$ and M. Assume that S' is the normalisation of a component of B' with coefficient 1, and that S is its birational transform on X. Replacing X we may assume ϕ is a log resolution of (X', B'). Write

$$K_X + B + M = \phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + M')$$

and let

$$K_S + B_S + M_S := (K_X + B + M)|_S$$

where $B_S = (B - S)|_S$ and $M_S = M|_S$. Let ψ be the induced morphism $S \to S'$ and let $B_{S'} = \psi_* B_S$ and $M_{S'} = \psi_* M_S$. Then we get the equality

$$K_{S'} + B_{S'} + M_{S'} = (K_{X'} + B' + M')|_{S'}$$

which we refer to as *generalised (divisorial) adjunction*. Note that

$$K_S + B_S + M_S = \psi^*(K_{S'} + B_{S'} + M_{S'})$$

It is obvious that $B_{S'}$ depends on both B' and M. When $M = 0$, we recover the usual *divisorial adjunction*.

By [7, Remark 4.7], if $(X', B' + M')$ is generalised lc, then $B_{S'}$ is a boundary divisor on S', i.e. its coefficients belong to $[0, 1]$. We consider $(S', B_{S'} + M_{S'})$ as a generalised pair which comes with data $S \overset{\psi}{\to} S'$ and M_S. It is also clear that $(S', B_{S'} + M_{S'})$ is generalised lc if $(X', B' + M')$ is generalised lc.

Lemma 3.2 (Generalised inversion of adjunction)**.** *Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised pair with data $X \overset{\phi}{\to} X'$ and M. Assume S' is a component of B' with coefficient 1, and that (X', S') is plt. Let*

$$K_{S'} + B_{S'} + M_{S'} = (K_{X'} + B' + M')|_{S'}$$

be given by generalised adjunction. If $(S', B_{S'} + M_{S'})$ is generalised lc, then $(X', B' + M')$ is generalised lc near S'.

Proof. Assume $(X', B' + M')$ is not generalised lc near S'. We can assume ϕ is a log resolution. Write

$$K_X + B + M = \phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + M').$$

By assumption $\phi(B^{>1})$ intersects S'. Pick $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently close to 1, let $\Gamma' = (1 - \alpha)S' + \alpha B'$, and write

$$K_X + \Gamma + \alpha M = \phi^*(K_{X'} + \Gamma' + \alpha M').$$

Then $(X', \Gamma' + \alpha M')$ is not generalised lc near S'. On the other hand, since (X', S') is plt and $(S', B_{S'} + M_{S'})$ is generalised lc, $(S', \Gamma_{S'} + \alpha M_{S'})$ is generalised klt where

$$K_{S'} + \Gamma_{S'} + \alpha M_{S'} = (K_{X'} + \Gamma' + \alpha M')|_{S'}$$

is generalised adjunction. Thus replacing B' with Γ' and M with αM, we can assume $(S', B_{S'} + M_{S'})$ is generalised klt.

Pick an ample divisor $A \geq 0$ and an effective divisor $C \geq 0$ such that $A + C \sim 0/X'$ and that S is not a component of C. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be small and pick a general $0 \leq G \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \epsilon A + M/X'$. Let $\Delta := B + G + \epsilon C$. Then $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0/X'$, hence $K_X + \Delta = \phi^*(K_{X'} + \Delta')$. In particular, (X', Δ') is not lc near S' as $\Delta \geq B$. On the other hand, by assumption, (S, B_S) is sub-klt where $K_S + B_S = (K_X + B)|_S$. This implies (S, Δ_S) is also sub-klt by construction of Δ where $K_S + \Delta_S = (K_X + \Delta)|_S$. Therefore, letting $K_{S'} + \Delta_{S'} = (K_{X'} + \Delta')|_{S'}$ we see that $(S', \Delta_{S'})$ is klt because $K_S + \Delta_S$ is the pullback of $K_{S'} + \Delta_{S'}$. This contradicts the usual inversion of adjunction [21].

□

The next result is similar to [34, Proposition 3.9].

Lemma 3.3. *Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathfrak{R} \subset [0, 1]$ be a finite set of rational numbers. Then there is a finite set of rational numbers $\mathfrak{S} \subset [0, 1]$ depending only on p and $\mathfrak{R}$ satisfying the following. Assume $(X', B' + M')$ is a generalised lc pair of dimension d with data $X \overset{\phi}{\to} X' \to Z$ and M, assume S' is the normalisation of a component of $\lfloor B' \rfloor$, and assume*

- *$B' \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$ and pM is Cartier, and*
- *$B_{S'}$ is given by the generalised adjunction*

$$K_{S'} + B_{S'} + M_{S'} = (K_{X'} + B' + M')|_{S'}.$$

Then $B_{S'} \in \Phi(\mathfrak{S})$.

Proof. As in [7, Remark 4.8], by taking hypersurface sections, we can reduce the lemma to the case $\dim X' = 2$. Let V be a prime divisor on S' and assume $\mu_V B_{S'} < 1$. Then as in the proof of [7, Proposition 4.9], (X', B') is plt near the image of the generic point of V and the coefficient of V in $B_{S'}$ is of the form

$$\mu_V B_{S'} = 1 - \frac{1}{l} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{b_i \alpha_i}{l} + \frac{\beta}{pl}$$

where $l \in \mathbb{N}$ is divisible by the Cartier index along V of any Weil divisor, b_i are the coefficients of B', and $\alpha_i, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$.

Expanding $\mathfrak{R}$ we can assume $\frac{p-1}{p} \in \mathfrak{R}$, hence $\frac{1}{p} \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$. Put $\alpha_{n+1} := \beta$ and $b_{n+1} := \frac{1}{p}$. So we can write $\mu_V B_{S'} = 1 - \frac{1}{l} + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \frac{b_i \alpha_i}{l}$. For each i there is $r_i \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b_i = 1 - \frac{r_i}{m_i}$. Let $s := 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i \alpha_i$. Then $\mu_V B_{S'} = 1 - \frac{s}{l}$ and $s > 0$. Removing the zero terms and re-arranging the indexes we can assume $s = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{t} b_i \alpha_i$, and that $b_i \alpha_i > 0$ for every i otherwise $\mu_V B_{S'} = 1 - \frac{1}{l}$ is just a standard coefficient. Note that since $s > 0$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{t} b_i \alpha_i < 1$, hence α_i are bounded. Moreover, $b_i \geq 1 - \frac{1}{m_i}$ which means $b_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$ if $m_i > 1$.

Now assume $t = 1$. Then either $m_1 \leq 2$, or $m_1 > 2$ and $\alpha_1 = 1$, hence in any case $s = \frac{s'}{m_1}$ where there are only finitely many possibilities for s'. Thus $\mu_V B_{S'} = 1 - \frac{s}{l} = 1 - \frac{s'}{m_1 l} \in \Phi(\mathfrak{S})$ if we choose $\mathfrak{S}$ so that it contains all such s'. We can then assume $t > 1$. If $m_i = 1$ for every i, then there are finitely many possibilities for $s = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{t} (1 - r_i)\alpha_i$ and we let $s' = s$. But if some $m_i > 1$, say for simplicity $m_1 > 1$, then $\alpha_1 = 1$ and $m_i = 1$ for $i > 1$. Then $s = \frac{r_1}{m_1} - \sum_{i=2}^{t} (1 - r_i)\alpha_i$, hence m_1 is bounded, so $s = \frac{s'}{m_1}$ for some s' for which there are only finitely many possibilities. As before taking $\mathfrak{S}$ so that it contains all such s', we get $\mu_V B_{S'} \in \Phi(\mathfrak{S})$. □

3.4. **Adjunction for fibre spaces.** (1) Let (X, B) be a projective sub-pair and let $f\colon X \to Z$ be a contraction with $\dim Z > 0$ such that (X, B) is sub-lc near the generic fibre of f, and $K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0/Z$. Below we recall a construction based on [22] giving a kind of canonical bundle formula which we refer to as *adjunction for fibre spaces* [1][34, §7].

For each prime divisor D on Z we let t_D be the lc threshold of f^*D with respect to (X, B) over the generic point of D, that is, t_D is the largest number so that $(X, B + t_D f^*D)$ is sub-lc over the generic point of D. Of course f^*D may not be well-defined everywhere but at least it is defined over the smooth locus of Z, in particular, near the generic point of D, and that is all we need. Next let $b_D = 1 - t_D$, and then define $B_Z = \sum b_D D$ where the sum runs over all the prime divisors on Z. By assumption, $K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{R}} f^*L_Z$ for some $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier $\mathbb{R}$-divisor L_Z on Z. Letting $M_Z = L_Z - (K_Z + B_Z)$ we get

$$K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{R}} f^*(K_Z + B_Z + M_Z).$$

We call B_Z the *discriminant part* and M_Z the *moduli part* of adjunction. Obviously B_Z is uniquely determined but M_Z depends on the choice of L_Z. However, M_Z is determined uniquely up to $\mathbb{R}$-linear equivalence.

Now let $\phi\colon X' \to X$ and $\psi\colon Z' \to Z$ be birational morphisms from normal projective varieties and assume the induced map $f'\colon X' \dashrightarrow Z'$ is a morphism. Let $K_{X'} + B' = \phi^*(K_X + B)$. Similar to above we can define a discriminant divisor $B_{Z'}$, and taking $L_{Z'} = \psi^* L_Z$ gives a moduli divisor $M_{Z'}$ so that

$$K_{X'} + B' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} f'^*(K_{Z'} + B_{Z'} + M_{Z'})$$

and $B_Z = \psi_* B_{Z'}$ and $M_Z = \psi_* M_{Z'}$.

(2) We want to show M_Z depends only on (X, B) near the generic fibre of f, even birationally. We make this more precise. In addition to the assumptions of (1), suppose we are given another projective sub-pair $(\overline{X}, \overline{B})$ and a contraction $\overline{X} \to Z$ such that $K_{\overline{X}}+\overline{B} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0/Z$. Moreover, suppose we have a birational map $X \dashrightarrow \overline{X}/Z$, and suppose there is a common resolution of X and $\overline{X}$ on which the pullback of $K_X + B$ and $K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{B}$ are equal near the generic fibre over Z. Let $\overline{B}_{Z'}$ and $\overline{M}_{Z'}$ be the discriminant and moduli parts of adjunction on Z' defined for $(\overline{X}, \overline{B})$ and the contraction $\overline{X} \to Z$.

Lemma 3.5. *Under the above notation and assumptions, $M_{Z'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{M}_{Z'}$.*

Proof. Replacing both X and $\overline{X}$ with a common resolution over Z', replacing $K_X + B$ and $K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{B}$ with their crepant pullbacks, and replacing Z with Z' we can assume $\overline{X} = X$, $Z' = Z$, and that $\overline{B} = B$ near the generic fibre. Then $\overline{B} - B$ is vertical over Z and $\overline{B} - B \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0/Z$. So $\overline{B} - B = f^*P$ for some P on Z. Therefore, by definition of the discriminant part, $\overline{B}_Z = B_Z + P$ from which we get $\overline{M}_Z \sim_{\mathbb{R}} M_Z$ because

$$K_Z + B_Z + M_Z + P \sim_{\mathbb{R}} K_Z + \overline{B}_Z + \overline{M}_Z.$$

□

(3) When (X, B) is lc over the generic point of Z we have:

Theorem 3.6. *Under the notation and assumptions of (1), suppose (X, B) is lc near the generic fibre of f. Let Z' be a sufficiently high resolution of Z. Then*

(i) *$M_{Z'}$ is pseudo-effective, and*

(ii) *if B is a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor, then $M_{Z'}$ is nef and for any birational morphism $Z'' \to Z'$ from a normal projective variety, $M_{Z''}$ is the pullback of $M_{Z'}$.*

Proof. Let Γ be the boundary divisor obtained from B by removing components that have negative coefficients or are vertical/Z. Note that over the generic point of Z we have $\Gamma = B$. Let $\phi\colon W \to X$ be a log resolution and let Γ_W be the sum of the horizontal/Z part of the reduced exceptional divisor of ϕ and the birational transform of Γ. We can choose W so that every lc centre of (W, Γ_W) is horizontal/Z. Running an MMP on $K_W + \Gamma_W$ over X we reach a model X' so that (X', Γ') is a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt model of (X, B) over the generic point of Z. Let $K_{X'} + B'$ be the pullback of $K_X + B$. Replacing (X, B) with (X', B') and replacing (X, Γ) with (X', Γ') we can assume (X, Γ) is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt with every lc centre horizontal/Z, and that every component of Γ is horizontal/Z.

We prove (ii) first. By [5, Theorem 1.4] we can replace X with a model on which $K_X + \Gamma$ is semi-ample over Z, hence defining a contraction $X \to Y/Z$. Since $K_X + \Gamma \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Y$, by Lemma 3.5, we can replace Z with Y and replace B with Γ, hence assume (X, B) is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt. The claim then follows from Fujino-Gongyo [10] (this relies on Ambro [2] in the klt case).

Now we prove (i). By standard arguments we can find $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors B^i and numbers $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$ with $\sum \alpha_i = 1$ such that $B = \sum \alpha_i B^i$, (X, B^i) is lc over the generic point of Z, and $K_X + B^i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$. Let $B^i_{Z'}$ and $M^i_{Z'}$ be the discriminant and moduli parts defined for (X, B^i) over Z. Let D be a prime divisor on Z and let t_i be the lc threshold of f^*D with respect to (X, B^i) over the generic point of D. Then $(X, B + (\sum \alpha_i t_i) f^*D)$ is lc over the generic point of D, hence $t \geq \sum \alpha_i t_i$ where t is the lc threshold of f^*D with respect to (X, B) over the generic point of D. Then $1 - t \leq \alpha_i(1 - t_i)$ from which we deduce $B_Z \leq \sum \alpha_i B^i_Z$. Similarly we can prove $B_{Z'} \leq \sum \alpha_i B^i_{Z'}$. This shows $M_{Z'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \sum \alpha_i M^i_{Z'} + P$ for some $P \geq 0$. Therefore, $M_{Z'}$ is pseudo-effective as each $M^i_{Z'}$ is nef.

□

(4) We relate the singularities of (X, B) and $(Z, B_Z + M_Z)$ though in a rough sense.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. Under the notation and assumptions of (1), suppose there is a prime divisor S on some birational model of X such that $a(S, X, B) \leq \epsilon$ and that S is vertical over Z. Then there is a resolution $Z' \to Z$ and a component T of $B_{Z'}$ with coefficient $\geq 1 - \epsilon$.*

Proof. Pick resolutions $X' \to X$ and $Z' \to Z$ so that the induced map $f' \colon X' \dashrightarrow Z'$ is a morphism and so that S is a prime divisor on X' and its image on Z' is a prime divisor T. Let $K_{X'} + B'$ be the pullback of $K_X + B$. Since $a(S, X, B) \leq \epsilon$, the coefficient of S in B' is at least $1 - \epsilon$. Thus the lc threshold of f'^*T with respect to (X', B') over the generic point of T is at most ϵ. Therefore, the coefficient of T in $B_{Z'}$ is at least $1 - \epsilon$. □

3.8. **Adjunction on non-klt centres.**

Theorem 3.9 ([14, Theorem 4.2])**.** *Let Φ be a subset of $[0, 1]$ which contains 1. Let X be a projective variety of dimension d, and let G be a subvariety, with normalisation F. Suppose we are given a boundary B and an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor $\Delta \geq 0$, with the following properties:*

- *(X, B) is klt and $B \in \Phi$, and*
- *there is a unique non-klt place of $(X, B + \Delta)$ whose centre is G.*

Then there is a boundary Θ_F on F whose coefficients belong to

$$\{a \,|\, 1 - a \in \mathrm{LCT}_{d-1}(D(\Phi))\} \cup \{1\}$$

such that

$$K_F + \Theta_F + P_F \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (K_X + B + \Delta)|_F$$

where P_F is pseudo-effective.

Now suppose that G is a general member of a covering family of subvarieties of X. Let $\psi \colon F' \to F$ be a log resolution of (F, Θ_F), and let $\Theta_{F'}$ be the sum of the birational transform of Θ_F and the reduced exceptional divisor of ψ. Then

$$K_{F'} + \Theta_{F'} \geq (K_X + B)|_{F'}.$$

In the theorem $D(\Phi)$ is a set associated to Φ with the property: $D(\Phi)$ is DCC iff Φ is DCC [14, 3.4]. The set $\mathrm{LCT}_{d-1}(D(\Phi))$ stands for the set of all lc thresholds of integral effective divisors with respect to pairs (S, Γ) of dimension $d - 1$ such that $\Gamma \in D(\Phi)$.

In the proof of the next two lemmas we recall the construction of Θ_F and P_F and the proof of 3.9 following [14] but with more details.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $(X, B), \Delta, G, F$, and Θ_F, be as in Theorem 3.9 where G is not necessarily a general member of a covering family. Let $M \geq 0$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X with coefficients ≥ 1 and such that $G \nsubseteq \operatorname{Supp} M$. Then for every component D of $M_F := M|_F$ we have $\mu_D(\Theta_F + M_F) \geq 1$.*

Proof. Let Γ be the sum of $(B + \Delta)^{<1}$ and the support of $(B + \Delta)^{\geq 1}$. Put $N = B + \Delta - \Gamma$ which is supported in $\lfloor \Gamma \rfloor$. Let $\phi \colon W \to X$ be a log resolution and let Γ_W be the sum of the reduced exceptional divisor of ϕ and the birational transform of Γ. Let

$$N_W = \phi^*(K_X + B + \Delta) - (K_W + \Gamma_W).$$

Then $\phi_* N_W = N \geq 0$ and N_W is supported in $\lfloor \Gamma_W \rfloor$. Now run an MMP$/X$ on $K_W + \Gamma_W$ with scaling of some ample divisor. We reach a model Y on which $K_Y + \Gamma_Y$ is a limit of movable$/X$ divisors. Applying the general negativity lemma (cf. [5, Lemma 3.3]), we deduce $N_Y \geq 0$. In particular, if $U \subseteq X$ is the set of points where $(X, B + \Delta)$ is lc, then

$N_Y = 0$ over U and (Y, Γ_Y) is a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt model of $(X, B + \Delta)$ over U. Since there is a unique non-klt place of $(X, B + \Delta)$ with centre G, $(X, B + \Delta)$ is lc but not klt at the generic point of G. In particular, we can assume there is a unique component S of $\lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor$ mapping onto G. Moreover, $G \cap U \neq \emptyset$, so G is not inside the image of N_Y.

Let $h\colon S \to F$ be the contraction induced by $S \to G$. By divisorial adjunction we can write

$$K_S + \Gamma_S + N_S = (K_Y + \Gamma_Y + N_Y)|_S \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0/F$$

where $N_S = N_Y|_S$ is vertical over F. If S is exceptional over X, then let Σ_Y be the sum of the exceptional$/X$ divisors on Y plus the birational transform of B. Otherwise let Σ_Y be the sum of the exceptional$/X$ divisors on Y plus the birational transform of B plus $(1 - \mu_G B)S$. In any case, S is a component of $\lfloor \Sigma_Y \rfloor$ and $\Sigma_Y \leq \Gamma_Y$. Applying adjunction again we get $K_S + \Sigma_S = (K_Y + \Sigma_Y)|_S$. Obviously $\Sigma_S \leq \Gamma_S$.

Now Θ_F is defined as follows. For each prime divisor D on F, let t be the lc threshold of h^*D with respect to (S, Σ_S) over the generic point of D, and then let $\mu_D \Theta_F := 1 - t$ [14, proof of Theorem 4.2]. One then chooses P_F to satisfy

$$K_S + \Gamma_S + N_S \sim_{\mathbb{R}} h^*(K_F + \Theta_F + P_F).$$

Let Δ_F and R_F be the discriminant and the moduli parts of adjunction for $(S, \Gamma_S + N_S)$ over F. Since $\Sigma_S \leq \Gamma_S + N_S$, we have $\Theta_F \leq \Delta_F$, hence $P_F - R_F \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta_F - \Theta_F \geq 0$. By Theorem 3.6, R_F is pseudo-effective which implies P_F is pseudo-effective too.

Let $\Sigma'_Y := \Sigma_Y + M_Y$ and $\Sigma'_S = \Sigma_S + M_S$ where $M_Y = M|_Y$ and $M_S = M_Y|_S$. We define Θ'_F similar to Θ_F. That is, for each prime divisor D on F, let t' be the lc threshold of h^*D with respect to (S, Σ'_S) over the generic point of D, and then let $\mu_D \Theta'_F := 1 - t'$. It is easy to see $t' + \mu_D M_F = t$. This means $\Theta'_F = \Theta_F + M_F$. On the other hand, since the coefficients of M are at least 1 and since S is not a component of M_Y,

$$\operatorname{Supp} M_Y \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} \lfloor \Sigma_Y + M_Y - S \rfloor = \operatorname{Supp} \left\lfloor \Sigma'_Y - S \right\rfloor.$$

Therefore, $\operatorname{Supp} M_S \subset \lfloor \Sigma'_S \rfloor$. In particular, as $h^*M_F = M_S$, if D is a component of M_F, then every component of h^*D mapping onto D is a component of $\lfloor \Sigma'_S \rfloor$. Thus $t' \leq 0$ where as above t' is the lc threshold of h^*D with respect to (S, Σ'_S) over the generic point of D. Therefore, $\mu_D(\Theta_F + M_F) = \mu_D \Theta'_F = 1 - t' \geq 1$.

□

Lemma 3.11. *Let $(X, B), \Delta, G, F$, and Θ_F be as in Theorem 3.9 where G is a general member of a covering family of subvarieties. Assume (X, B) is ϵ-lc for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then there is a sub-boundary B_F on F such that $K_F + B_F = (K_X + B)|_F$, that (F, B_F) is sub-ϵ-lc, and $B_F \leq \Theta_F$.*

Proof. Step 1. There is a contraction $\tilde{f}\colon \tilde{V} \to \tilde{T}$ of normal projective varieties such that G is isomorphic to a general fibre of $\tilde{f}$, and there is a surjective morphism $\tilde{V} \to X$ whose restriction to each fibre of $\tilde{f}$ over a closed point is a closed immersion (see 2.12). In particular, identifying G with the fibre mentioned, the induced morphism $G \to X$ maps G onto itself. Taking normalisations of $\tilde{V}$ and $\tilde{T}$, we get a contraction $f\colon V \to T$ of normal projective varieties such that the fibre of f corresponding to G is just F the normalisation of G. Taking resolutions of V and T we get a contraction $f'\colon V' \to T'$ of smooth projective varieties. Letting F' be the fibre of f' corresponding to F, we see that the induced morphism $F' \to X$ is birational onto its image. Moreover, we can assume there is a Cartier divisor $P \geq 0$ on X whose support contains $\operatorname{Supp} B$ and the singular locus of X and such that $Q' := \operatorname{Supp} g'^*P$ is relatively simple normal crossing over some open subset of T' where

g' is the induced map $V' \to X$.

Step 2. Fixing G, by construction, f' is smooth over $t' = f'(F')$, g' is smooth over $g'(\eta_{F'})$, and $g'(\eta_{F'})$ is smooth on X. If g' is generically finite let $W' := V'$ and $R' := T'$. If not, applying Lemma 2.13, there is a general smooth hypersurface section H' of T' passing through t' so that if $U' = f'^*H'$, then U' and H' are smooth, $U' \to H'$ is smooth over t', and $U' \to X$ is surjective and smooth over $g'(\eta_{F'})$. Repeating this we get a smooth subvariety R' of T' passing through t' so that the induced family $W' \to R'$ is smooth over t', W' is smooth, $W' \to X$ is surjective and generically finite and étale over $g'(\eta_{F'})$. Let $Q_{W'} = Q'|_{W'}$. Then by construction, $Q_{W'}|_{F'} = Q'|_{F'}$ is reduced and simple normal crossing. Therefore, near F' the divisor $Q_{W'}$ is reduced and any prime divisor C' on F' is contained in at most one component of $Q_{W'}$.

Step 3. Let $K_{W'} + B_{W'}$ be the pullback of $K_X + B$ to W'. Here $K_{W'}$ and $B_{W'}$ are uniquely determined as Weil divisors (we assume we have already fixed a choice of K_X). Let $W' \to W \to X$ be the Stein factorisation of $W' \to X$. By the Riemann-Hurwitz formula, each coefficient of B_W is $\leq 1 - \epsilon$ where $K_W + B_W$ is the pullback of $K_X + B$. Thus (W, B_W) is sub-ϵ-lc by [31, Proposition 5.20], hence $(W', B_{W'})$ is also sub-ϵ-lc. On the other hand, by our choice of P, any component of $B_{W'}$ with positive coefficient is mapped into P, hence it is a component of $Q_{W'}$. Moreover, since G was chosen general, it is not inside $\operatorname{Supp} K_X \cup \operatorname{Supp} P$. Thus since $W' \to X$ is étale over $g'(\eta_{F'})$, F' is not inside $\operatorname{Supp} B_{W'}$ nor inside $\operatorname{Supp} K_{W'}$. Defining $B_{F'} = B_{W'}|_{F'}$ we get $K_{F'} + B_{F'} = (K_{W'} + B_{W'})|_{F'}$ where $K_{F'} = K_{W'}|_{F'}$ follows from the fact that $W' \to R'$ is smooth near F' (note that $K_{F'}$ is determined as a Weil divisor). Let $K_F + B_F$ be the pushdown of $K_{F'} + B_{F'}$ which satisfies $K_F + B_F = (K_X + B)|_F$.

Step 4. To show (F, B_F) is sub-ϵ-lc, it is enough to show $(F', B_{F'})$ is sub-ϵ-lc. This in turn follows if show $(F', A_{F'})$ is ϵ-lc where $A_{W'} := B^{\geq 0}_{W'}$ and $A_{F'} = A_{W'}|_{F'}$. By the last paragraph, $\operatorname{Supp} A_{W'} \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} Q_{W'}$, hence

$$\operatorname{Supp} A_{F'} = \operatorname{Supp} A_{W'}|_{F'} \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} Q_{W'}|_{F'} = \operatorname{Supp} Q'|_{F'}.$$

So $\operatorname{Supp} A_{F'}$ is simple normal crossing as $\operatorname{Supp} Q'|_{F'}$ is simple normal crossing. Therefore, it is enough to show each coefficient of $A_{F'}$ is $\leq 1 - \epsilon$. Let C' be a component of $A_{F'}$ with positive coefficient. Then there is a component D' of $A_{W'}$ with positive coefficient so that C' is a component of $D'|_{F'}$. Since D' is a component of $Q_{W'}$, by the second paragraph of this proof, D' is uniquely determined and $D'|_{F'}$ is reduced. Then $\mu_{D'} B_{W'} = \mu_{D'} A_{W'} = \mu_{C'} A_{F'}$. But $\mu_{D'} B_{W'} \leq 1 - \epsilon$ because $(W', B_{W'})$ is sub-ϵ-lc, hence $\mu_{C'} A_{F'} \leq 1 - \epsilon$.

Step 5. It remains to show $B_F \leq \Theta_F$. Assume C is a prime divisor on F with $\mu_C B_F > 0$. Let C' on F' be the birational transform of C. Then $\mu_{C'} B_{F'} > 0$. Thus there is a unique component D' of $B^{\geq 0}_{W'}$ with positive coefficient such that C' is a component of $D'|_{F'}$. In particular, $\mu_{C'} B_{F'} \leq \mu_{D'} B_{W'}$ as $D'|_{F'}$ is reduced. Let $L = cP$ and let $L_{W'} = L|_{W'}$ and $L_{F'} = L|_{F'}$ where c is a number. Choose c so that $\mu_{D'} L_{W'} = 1$. Then $\mu_{C'} L_{F'} = \mu_{D'} L_{W'} = 1$.

We use the notation of the proof of Lemma 3.10. Recall that we constructed a birational morphism $Y \to X$ which we denote by π, a boundary Σ_Y, and a component S of $\lfloor \Sigma_Y \rfloor$ mapping onto G. Let $L_S = L|_S$ and let t be the lc threshold of L_S with respect to (S, Σ_S) over the generic point η_C of C. By construction, $\mu_C(L|_F) = \mu_{C'} L_{F'} = 1$, so under $h \colon S \to F$ the divisor L_S is equal to h^*C over η_C. Therefore, $\mu_C \Theta_F = 1 - t$.

Let s be the lc threshold of L with respect to (X, B) near $\nu(\eta_C)$ where ν denotes $F \to G$. Let I be the minimal non-klt centre of $(X, B+sL)$ which contains $\nu(\eta_C)$. Since $G \not\subseteq \operatorname{Supp} L$, $G \not\subseteq I$. Let $L_Y = \pi^*L$ and write $K_Y + B_Y = \pi^*(K_X + B)$. Let I_Y be a non-klt centre of $(Y, B_Y + sL_Y)$ which maps onto I. Since $\Sigma_Y \geq B_Y$, I_Y is also a non-klt centre of $(Y, \Sigma_Y + sL_Y)$. Note that $I_Y \neq S$.

Step 6. In this step we assume X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. We will show $t \leq s$. This follows if we show that some non-klt centre of $(S, \Sigma_S + sL_S)$ maps onto C. Let Π be the fibre of π over a general closed point of $\nu(C)$ and let H be the corresponding fibre of $S \to G$. Then Π is connected, and since X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial, Π is inside the union of the exceptional divisors of π, hence $\Pi \subset \lfloor \Sigma_Y \rfloor$. Moreover, I_Y intersects Π.

Let E be the connected component of H which maps into C under $S \to F$. If a component R of $\lfloor \Sigma_Y \rfloor - S$ intersects E, then $R \cap S$ gives a non-klt centre of $(S, \Sigma_S + sL_S)$ mapping onto C (note that $(\lfloor \Sigma_Y \rfloor - S) \cap S$ is vertical over F). Assume there is no such R. Then $E = H = \Pi$ otherwise since Π is connected, there is a connected chain of curves $Z_1, \dots, Z_r$ in Π such that $Z_i \not\subseteq E$, Z_1 intersects E, and the chain connects E to some point in $\Pi \setminus E$: this is not possible because Z_1 cannot be inside $\lfloor \Sigma_Y \rfloor - S$, so it is inside S, hence it is inside E as it intersects E, a contradiction. Therefore, I_Y intersects E, so by inversion of adjunction $I_Y \cap S$ produces a non-klt centre of $(S, \Sigma_S + sL_S)$ intersecting E, and the centre maps onto C as required. Thus we have proved $t \leq s$.

Now since $(X, B + sL)$ is lc near $\nu(\eta_C)$, $(W', B_{W'} + sL_{W'})$ is sub-lc over $\nu(\eta_C)$ which implies

$$\mu_{D'} B_{W'} + s = \mu_{D'}(B_{W'} + sL_{W'}) \leq 1$$

where D' is as in Step 5. Therefore,

$$\mu_C B_F + t \leq \mu_{C'} B_{F'} + s \leq \mu_{D'} B_{W'} + s \leq 1$$

which in turn gives $\mu_C B_F \leq 1 - t = \mu_C \Theta_F$.

Step 7. Finally assume X is not $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial and let $\overline{X} \to X$ be a small $\mathbb{Q}$-factorialisation. Let $\overline{B}, \overline{\Delta}, \overline{G}$, etc, be the birational transforms of B, Δ, G, etc. We can assume $Y \to X$ and $W' \to X$ both factor through $\overline{X} \to X$. Let $\overline{F}$ be the normalisation of $\overline{G}$. Then we have induced morphisms $S \to \overline{F} \to F$, and we can define $\Theta_{\overline{F}}$ whose pushdown to F is just Θ_F. Also we can write $K_{\overline{F}} + B_{\overline{F}} = (K_X + B)|_{\overline{F}}$ where the pushdown of $B_{\overline{F}}$ is just B_F. Thus it is enough to show $B_{\overline{F}} \leq \Theta_{\overline{F}}$. Now apply the arguments of Step 6 on $\overline{X}$.

□

3.12. **Lifting sections from non-klt centres.** We now show that under suitable assumptions we can lift sections from a lc centre. This is a key ingredient of the proof of 4.7 in next section.

Proposition 3.13. *Let $d, r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$. Then there is $l \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on d, r, ϵ satisfying the following. Let $(X, B), \Delta, G, F, \Theta_F$, and P_F be as in Theorem 3.9 where G is a general member of a covering family of subvarieties. Assume in addition that*

- *X is Fano of dimension d, and $B = 0$,*
- *$\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -(n+1)K_X$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*
- *$h^0(-rnK_X|_F) \neq 0$, and*
- *P_F is big and for any choice of $P_F \geq 0$ in its $\mathbb{Q}$-linear equivalence class the pair $(F, \Theta_F + P_F)$ is ϵ-lc.*

Then $h^0(-lnrK_X) \neq 0$.

Proof. Step 1. We will use the notation of the proof of Lemma 3.10. First note that since $B = 0$ and Δ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor, Θ_F is a $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary, so we can assume P_F is a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor. Remember that (X, Δ) is lc near the generic point of G. We will show that under our assumptions G is actually an isolated non-klt centre of (X, Δ). Recall that $\lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor$ has a unique component S mapping onto G. Letting $\Delta_Y = \Gamma_Y + N_Y$ we have $K_Y + \Delta_Y = \pi^*(K_X + \Delta)$ where π denotes $Y \to X$. Let $K_S + \Delta_S = (K_Y + \Delta_Y)|_S$. Applying adjunction for fibre spaces we get

$$K_S + \Delta_S \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_F + \Delta_F + R_F)$$

where Δ_F is the discriminant part and R_F is the moduli part. Note that $\Delta_F + R_F \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta_F + P_F$.

Assume G is not an isolated non-klt centre. Then some non-klt centre $Z \neq S$ of (Y, Δ_Y) intersects S by the connectedness principle, hence some component of $\lfloor \Delta_Y - S \rfloor$ intersects S as the non-klt locus of (Y, Δ_Y) is equal to $\lfloor \Delta_Y \rfloor$. This in turn gives a component of $\lfloor \Delta_S \rfloor$ which is vertical over F as there is a unique non-klt place of (Y, Δ_Y) with centre G. Applying Lemma 3.7, there is a high resolution $F' \to F$ so that some component T of $\Delta_{F'}$ has coefficient at least 1.

Step 2. Pick a sufficiently small rational number $t > 0$. Since P_F is big, we can assume $P_F = A_F + C_F$ where A_F is ample and $C_F \geq 0$ both being $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors. Let $\Omega_F = \Theta_F + C_F$ and let $K_{F'} + \Omega_{F'}$ be the pullback of $K_F + \Omega_F$. Then the coefficient of T in $t\Omega_{F'} + (1-t)\Delta_{F'}$ is more than $1 - \epsilon$. As $R_{F'}$ is nef (3.6), we can find

$$0 \leq J_{F'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} tA_{F'} + (1-t)R_{F'}$$

where $A_{F'}$ is the pullback of A_F. Therefore,

$$(F', t\Omega_{F'} + (1-t)\Delta_{F'} + J_{F'})$$

is not sub-ϵ-lc. Moreover, as $K_{F'} + \Delta_{F'} + R_{F'}$ is the pullback of $K_F + \Delta_F + R_F$ and as $K_{F'} + \Omega_{F'} + A_{F'}$ is the pullback of $K_F + \Omega_F + A_F$, we see that

$$K_{F'} + t\Omega_{F'} + (1-t)\Delta_{F'} + J_{F'}$$

is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly trivial over F, hence it is the pullback of

$$K_F + t\Omega_F + (1-t)\Delta_F + J_F$$

where J_F is the pushdown of $J_{F'}$. Therefore,

$$(F, t\Omega_F + (1-t)\Delta_F + J_F)$$

is not ϵ-lc.

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t\Omega_F + (1-t)\Delta_F + J_F &\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} t\Theta_F + tC_F + (1-t)\Delta_F + tA_F + (1-t)R_F \\ &= t\Theta_F + tP_F + (1-t)\Delta_F + (1-t)R_F \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta_F + P_F. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by construction, $\Delta_F \geq \Theta_F$, hence

$$t\Omega_F + (1-t)\Delta_F \geq t\Theta_F + (1-t)\Delta_F \geq \Theta_F.$$

This is a contradiction. So we have proved that G is an isolated non-klt centre of (X, Δ) and that (Y, Δ_Y) is plt near S.

Step 3. Let $E = \pi^*(-rnK_X)$. Then E is integral near S because K_X is Cartier near the generic point of G and because S does not intersect any exceptional divisor of π except S itself. Let V be a prime divisor on S. If V is horizontal over G, then E is Cartier near the

generic point of V. Assume V is vertical over G. We want to show the Cartier index of E near the generic point of V is bounded. Let p be the Cartier index of $K_Y + S$ near the generic point of V. Then $\mu_V \Delta_S \geq 1 - \frac{1}{p}$ and the Cartier index of E near the generic point of V divides p [38, Proposition 3.9]. Therefore, $\frac{1}{p} \geq \epsilon$ otherwise we can apply Lemma 3.7 and apply arguments similar to step 1 to choose P_F so that $(F, \Theta_F + P_F)$ is not ϵ-lc which would give a contradiction. This means that p is bounded depending only on ϵ, hence the Cartier index of E near the generic point of V is also bounded.

Step 4. Using the notation of the proof of 3.10, $\Delta_Y = \Gamma_Y + N_Y$. Pick $2 \leq l \in \mathbb{N}$ and define L by the relation

$$\lceil lE - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - N_Y \rceil = lE - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - N_Y + L.$$

By construction, $N_Y + L$ is supported in $\lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - S$ which is disjoint from S by Step 2. As

$$K_Y + \Delta_Y = \pi^*(K_X + \Delta) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -n\pi^* K_X$$

the $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $I = lE - (K_Y + \Delta_Y)$ is nef and big. We can write

$$\lceil lE - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - N_Y \rceil = lE - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - N_Y + L$$

$$\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_Y + \Delta_Y + I - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - N_Y + L = K_Y + \Gamma_Y - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor + L + I.$$

Since $(Y, \Gamma_Y - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor + L)$ is klt, by Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing

$$h^1(\lceil lE - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - N_Y \rceil) = 0.$$

By the previous step, we can choose a bounded l as above such that if U is the largest open set on which $\lceil lE - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor + S - N_Y \rceil$ is Cartier, then the codimension of $S \setminus (S \cap U)$ in S is at least 2 where we use the fact that $\lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - S + N_Y$ does not intersect S and that E is integral near S. Thus by Lemma 2.26, we have the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(\lceil lE - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - N_Y \rceil) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(\lceil lE - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor + S - N_Y \rceil) \to \mathcal{O}_S(\lceil lE \rceil|_S) \to 0.$$

Now

$$\lceil lE \rceil|_S = lE|_S = f^*(-lnrK_X|_F)$$

and by assumption, $h^0(-lnrK_X|_F) \neq 0$, hence $h^0(\lceil lE \rceil|_S) \neq 0$. Therefore,

$$h^0(\lceil lE - \lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor + S - N_Y \rceil) \neq 0$$

hence $h^0(\lceil lE \rceil) \neq 0$ which implies $h^0(-lnrK_X) \neq 0$.

□

4. **Effective birationality**

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2 under certain extra assumptions. These special cases are crucial for the proof of all the main results of this paper.

4.1. **Singularities in bounded families.**

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a bounded set of couples. Then there is $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ depending only on $\epsilon, \mathcal{P}$ satisfying the following. Let (X, B) be a projective pair and let T be a reduced divisor on X. Assume*

- *(X, B) is ϵ-lc and $(X, \operatorname{Supp} B + T) \in \mathcal{P}$,*
- *$L \geq 0$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier $\mathbb{R}$-divisor on X,*
- *$L \sim_{\mathbb{R}} N$ for some $\mathbb{R}$-divisor N supported in T, and*
- *the absolute value of each coefficient of N is at most δ.*

Then $(X, B + L)$ is klt.

Proof. We may assume all the members of $\mathcal{P}$ have the same dimension, say d. We prove the proposition by induction on d. Let $(X, B), T, L, N$ be as in the statement for some δ, and assume $(X, B + L)$ is not klt. First assume $d = 1$. Then $\deg L \geq \epsilon$, hence $\deg N \geq \epsilon$. This is not possible if δ is small enough because $\deg N \leq \delta \deg T$ and $\deg T$ is bounded. So we can assume $d \geq 2$.

We can find a log resolution $\phi\colon W \to X$ of $(X, B + T)$ such that if we write

$$K_W + B_W = \phi^*(K_X + B) + E$$

where $B_W \geq 0$ and $E \geq 0$ have no common components, and let T_W be the sum of the birational transform of T and the reduced exceptional divisor ϕ, then (W, B_W) is ϵ-lc and $(W, \operatorname{Supp} B_W + T_W)$ belongs to a bounded set of couples depending only on $\mathcal{P}$. Let $L_W = \phi^*L$ and $N_W = \phi^*N$. Then there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on $\mathcal{P}$ so that the absolute value of each coefficient of N_W is $\leq m\delta$. Therefore, we can replace $\mathcal{P}$ and replace $(X, B), T, L, N, \delta$ with $(W, B_W), T_W, L_W, N_W, m\delta$, hence assume from now on that $(X, \operatorname{Supp} B + T)$ is log smooth. Moreover, we may replace T so that B and T have no common components and T is very ample.

Now assume δ is sufficiently small. Let D be a prime divisor on birational models of X such that $a(D, X, B + L) \leq 0$. We show D is not a divisor on X. Since T is very ample and T^d is bounded, from $T^{d-1} \cdot L = T^{d-1} \cdot N \leq \delta T^d$ we deduce if l is a coefficient of L, then $l \leq \delta T^d$. This shows that D cannot be a divisor on X as we can assume $\mu_D(B + L) < 1$. Therefore, D is exceptional$/X$.

Let V be the centre of D on X. First assume V is not inside $\operatorname{Supp} B$. In this case we can remove B and assume $B = 0$. Let H be a general member of $|rT|$ intersecting V where r is sufficiently large depending on $\mathcal{P}$. Then H is irreducible and smooth, (X, H) is plt but $(X, H + L)$ is not plt near any component of $V \cap H$. This implies (H, L_H) is not klt near any component of $V \cap H$ where $L_H = L|_H$ [31, Theorem 5.50]. Letting $N_H = N|_H$, we see that N_H is supported in $T_H = T|_H$ with absolute value of coefficients $\leq \delta$. By construction, (H, T_H) belongs to a bounded set of couples $\mathcal{Q}$. So applying induction we get a contradiction as δ can be chosen according to $\mathcal{Q}$ depending only on $\mathcal{P}$.

Now assume V is inside some component S of B. Let $\Delta = B + (1 - b)S$ where $b = \mu_S B$. Then (X, Δ) is plt and $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = S$. Moreover, by the arguments of the third paragraph of this proof we can assume $l = \mu_S L < \epsilon \leq 1 - b$, hence $B + L \leq \Delta + L - lS$. Thus S and V are both non-klt centres of $(X, \Delta + L - lS)$, so it cannot be plt near V. Let $K_S + \Delta_S = (K_S + \Delta)|_S$ and $L_S = (L - lS)|_S$. Then (S, Δ_S) is ϵ-lc but $(S, \Delta_S + L_S)$ is not klt. Perhaps after adding some components to T, we can assume $S \sim S'$ where S' is supported in T and with bounded coefficients. By construction, $L_S \sim_{\mathbb{R}} N_S := (N - lS')|_S$ is supported on $T_S := T|_S$ and the absolute value of each coefficient of N_S is at most $n\delta$ where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ depends only on $\mathcal{P}$. Moreover, $(S, \operatorname{Supp} \Delta_S + T_S)$ belongs to a bounded set of couples $\mathcal{R}$ depending only on $\mathcal{P}$. Now applying induction we again get a contradiction.

□

4.3. **Effective birationality for Fano varieties with good $\mathbb{Q}$-complements.**

Proposition 4.4. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon, \delta \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$. Then there exists a number v depending only on d, ϵ, and δ satisfying the following. Assume*

- *X is an ϵ-lc Fano variety of dimension d,*
- *$m \in \mathbb{N}$ is the smallest number such that $|-mK_X|$ defines a birational map,*
- *$n \in \mathbb{N}$ is a number such that $\operatorname{vol}(-nK_X) > (2d)^d$, and*

- $nK_X + N \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ *for some* $\mathbb{Q}$*-divisor* $N \geq 0$ *with coefficients* $\geq \delta$.

Then $\frac{m}{n} < v$.

Proof. Step 1. If the proposition does not hold, then there is a sequence X_i, m_i, n_i, N_i of Fano varieties, numbers, and divisors as in the statement such that the numbers $\frac{m_i}{n_i}$ form a strictly increasing sequence approaching ∞. Let $\phi_i \colon W_i \to X_i$ be a log resolution so that the movable part of $\phi_i^*(-m_iK_{X_i})$ is base point free. Let A_{W_i} be a general divisor linearly equivalent to the movable part and let R_{W_i} be the fixed part. So $\phi_i^*(-m_iK_{X_i}) \sim A_{W_i} + R_{W_i}$. We denote the pushdown of A_{W_i}, R_{W_i} to X_i by A_i, R_i respectively. Note that R_{W_i} is only a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor but R_i is integral.

Step 2. In this step i is fixed. Applying 2.16 (2), there is a bounded covering family of subvarieties of X_i (as in 2.12) such that for any two general closed points $x_i, y_i \in X_i$ we can choose a member G_i of the family and choose a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $0 \leq \Delta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -(n_i+1)K_{X_i}$ so that (X_i, Δ_i) is lc near x_i with a unique non-klt place whose centre contains x_i, that centre is G_i, and (X_i, Δ_i) is not lc near y_i. Note that since x_i, y_i are general, we can assume G_i is a general member of the family. Recall from 2.12 that this means the family is given by finitely many morphisms $V^j \to T^j$ of projective varieties with accompanying surjective morphisms $V^j \to X$ and that each G_i is a general fibre of one of these morphisms. Moreover, we can assume the points of T^j corresponding to such G_i are dense in T^j. Let $d_i := \max\{\dim V^j - \dim T^j\}$.

If $d_i = 0$, that is, if $\dim G_i = 0$ for all the G_i, then $-2(n_i+1)K_{X_i}$ is potentially birational, hence $|K_{X_i} - 2(n_i+1)K_{X_i}|$ defines a birational map [15, Lemma 2.3.4] which means $m_i \leq 2n_i + 1$ giving a contradiction as we can assume $m_i/n_i \gg 0$. Thus we can assume $d_i > 0$, so there is j such that $\dim G_i > 0$ for all the G_i appearing as general fibres of $V^j \to T^j$.

Define $l_i \in \mathbb{N}$ to be the smallest number so that $\operatorname{vol}(-l_iK_{X_i}|_{G_i}) > d^d$ for all the G_i with positive dimension. Then we can assume there is j so that if G_i is a general fibre of $V^j \to T^j$, then G_i is positive dimensional and $\operatorname{vol}(-(l_i-1)K_{X_i}|_{G_i}) \leq d^d$.

Step 3. Assume $\frac{l_i}{n_i}$ is bounded from above by some natural number a. Then after replacing n_i with dan_i and applying the second paragraph of 2.16 (2), for each i, we can replace the positive dimensional G_i with new ones of smaller dimension, and replace the family accordingly, hence decrease the number d_i. Repeating the process we get to the situation in which we can assume $\frac{l_i}{n_i}$ is an increasing sequence approaching ∞ otherwise we get the case $d_i = 0$ which yields a contradiction as in Step 2. On the other hand, if $\frac{m_i}{l_i}$ is not bounded from above, then we can assume $\frac{m_i}{l_i}$ is an increasing sequence approaching ∞, hence we can replace n_i with l_i in which case $\frac{l_i}{n_i}$ is bounded and we can argue as before. So we can assume $\frac{m_i}{l_i}$ is bounded from above.

In order to get a contradiction in the following steps it suffices to consider only those G_i which are positive dimensional and $\operatorname{vol}(-(l_i-1)K_{X_i}|_{G_i}) \leq d^d$. By Step 2, there is a sub-family of such G_i appearing as general fibres of some $V^j \to T^j$. *From now on when we mention* G_i *we assume it is positive dimensional and it satisfies the inequality just stated.* In particular,

$$\operatorname{vol}(-m_iK_{X_i}|_{G_i}) = (\frac{m_i}{l_i-1})^d \operatorname{vol}(-(l_i-1)K_{X_i}|_{G_i}) \leq (\frac{m_i}{l_i-1})^d d^d$$

is bounded from above, so $\mathrm{vol}(A_i|_{G_i})$ is bounded from above where A_i is as in Step 1.

Step 4. For each i pick a general G_i as in the last paragraph and let F_i be its normalisation. By Theorem 3.9 and the ACC for lc thresholds [14, Theorem 1.1], there is a $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary Θ_{F_i} with coefficients in a fixed DCC set Φ depending only on d such that we can write

$$(K_{X_i}+\Delta_i)|_{F_i} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_{F_i}+\Delta_{F_i} := K_{F_i}+\Theta_{F_i}+P_{F_i}$$

where P_{F_i} is pseudo-effective. By replacing n_i and adding to Δ_i we can assume $P_{F_i} \geq \frac{1}{m_i}M_{F_i}$ where $M_{F_i}=M_i|_{F_i}$ and $M_i := A_i+R_i$.

As G_i is among the general members of a covering family of subvarieties, by Lemma 3.11, we can write $K_{X_i}|_{F_i}=K_{F_i}+\Lambda_{F_i}$ for some sub-boundary Λ_{F_i} such that (F_i,Λ_{F_i}) is sub-ϵ-lc and $\Lambda_{F_i}\leq\Theta_{F_i}\leq\Delta_{F_i}$.

Step 5. Fix a rational number $\epsilon'\in(0,\epsilon)$ such that $\epsilon'<\min\Phi^{>0}$. Let $f_i\colon F_i'\to F_i$ be a log resolution of (F_i,Δ_{F_i}) so that the induced map $F_i' \dashrightarrow W_i$ is a morphism. Let $A_{F_i'}=A_{W_i}|_{F_i'}$ which is big and base point free, and let $H_{F_i'}\in|6dA_{F_i'}|$ be general. We define a boundary $\Omega_{F_i'}$ as follows. Let D be a prime divisor on F_i'. Then let the coefficient of D be

$$\mu_D\Omega_{F_i'} := \begin{cases} 1-\epsilon' & \text{if } D \text{ is exceptional}/F_i,\\ 1-\epsilon' & \text{if } D \text{ is a component of } M_{F_i'}:=M_i|_{F_i'},\\ \epsilon' & \text{if } D \text{ is a component of } \Theta_{F_i}^{\sim} \text{ but not of } M_{F_i'},\\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } D=H_{F_i'},\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}$$

where $\Theta_{F_i}^{\sim}$ is the birational transform of Θ_{F_i}. The pair $(F_i',\Omega_{F_i'})$ is log smooth, and by taking $\epsilon'<\frac{1}{2}$, we can assume it is ϵ'-lc. By Lemma 2.30, $K_{F_i'}+\Omega_{F_i'}$ is big.

Step 6. The aim of this step is show that $\mathrm{vol}(K_{F_i'}+\Omega_{F_i'})$ is bounded from above. The volume

$$\mathrm{vol}(K_{F_i}+\Delta_{F_i}+5dM_{F_i})$$

is bounded from above because of the relations

$$K_{F_i}+\Delta_{F_i}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -n_iK_{X_i}|_{F_i}\ ,\ 5dM_{F_i}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -5dm_iK_{X_i}|_{F_i}$$

and the fact that $\mathrm{vol}(-(n_i+5dm_i)K_{X_i}|_{F_i})$ is bounded from above, by the end of Step 3. Next we claim

$$\mathrm{vol}(K_{F_i}+\Omega_{F_i})\leq\mathrm{vol}(K_{F_i}+\Delta_{F_i}+5dM_{F_i})$$

where Ω_{F_i} is the pushdown of $\Omega_{F_i'}$. This follows if we show $\Delta_{F_i}+5dM_{F_i}-\Omega_{F_i}$ is big. As P_{F_i} is big, it is enough to show $\Theta_{F_i}+5dM_{F_i}-\Omega_{F_i}$ is big. Note that by Lemma 3.10, $\mu_D(\Theta_{F_i}+M_{F_i})\geq 1$ for any component D of M_{F_i}.

Let D be a component of Ω_{F_i}. Then either D is a component of M_{F_i} or a component of Θ_{F_i} or $D=H_{F_i}$ the pushdown of $H_{F_i'}$. In the first case,

$$\mu_D\Omega_{F_i}=1-\epsilon'<1\leq\mu_D(\Theta_{F_i}+M_{F_i}).$$

If D is as in the second case but not the first case, then

$$\epsilon'=\mu_D\Omega_{F_i}\leq\mu_D\Theta_{F_i}\leq\mu_D(\Theta_{F_i}+M_{F_i}).$$

So we get $\Omega_{F_i}-\frac{1}{2}H_{F_i}\leq\Theta_{F_i}+M_{F_i}$. On the other hand,

$$4dM_{F_i}-\frac{1}{2}H_{F_i}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 4dA_i|_{F_i}+4dR_i|_{F_i}-3dA_{F_i}$$

is big because $4dA_i|_{F_i} \geq 4dA_{F_i}$ where A_{F_i} is the pushdown of $A_{F_i'}$. This implies the bigness of $\Delta_{F_i} + 5dM_{F_i} - \Omega_{F_i}$.

Finally since

$$\operatorname{vol}(K_{F_i'} + \Omega_{F_i'}) \leq \operatorname{vol}(K_{F_i} + \Omega_{F_i})$$

we get the required boundedness of $\operatorname{vol}(K_{F_i'} + \Omega_{F_i'})$.

Step 7. We want to show (F_i', Ω'_{F_i}) is log birationally bounded. Let $\Sigma_{F_i'} := \operatorname{Supp} \Omega_{F_i'}$. First we show

$$\operatorname{vol}(K_{F_i'} + \Sigma_{F_i'} + 2(2d+1)A_{F_i'})$$

is bounded from above. Since $K_{F_i'} + \Omega_{F_i'}$ is big and since the coefficients of $\Omega_{F_i'}$ belong to $\{\epsilon', \frac{1}{2}, 1-\epsilon'\}$, there is $\alpha \in (0,1)$ depending only on d and ϵ' such that $K_{F_i'} + \alpha\Omega_{F_i'}$ is big [14, Lemma 7.3]. Since $\Omega_{F_i'} \geq \frac{1}{2}H_{F_i'}$ and since each coefficient of $(1-\alpha)\Omega_{F_i'}$ is at least $(1-\alpha)\epsilon'$, taking a large number p, say $p = \frac{3(2d+1)}{(1-\alpha)\epsilon'}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{vol}(K_{F_i'} + \Sigma_{F_i'} + 2(2d+1)A_{F_i'}) &\leq \operatorname{vol}(K_{F_i'} + \Omega_{F_i'} + p(1-\alpha)\Omega_{F_i'}) \\ &\leq \operatorname{vol}(K_{F_i'} + \Omega_{F_i'} + p(K_{F_i'} + \alpha\Omega_{F_i'}) + p(1-\alpha)\Omega_{F_i'}) \\ &\leq \operatorname{vol}((1+p)(K_{F_i'} + \Omega_{F_i'}))\end{aligned}$$

which shows the left hand side volume is bounded from above. By construction, $A_{F_i'}$ is base point free and $|A_{F_i'}|$ defines a birational map. Thus by [15, Lemma 3.2], $\Sigma_{F_i'} \cdot A_{F_i'}^{\dim F_i' - 1}$ is bounded from above. Therefore, (F_i', Ω'_{F_i}) is log birationally bounded by [15, Lemma 2.4.2(4)] as the volume of $A_{F_i'}$ is bounded.

If $F_i' \to \tilde{F}_i$ is the contraction defined by $A_{F_i'}$, then $(\tilde{F}_i, \Sigma_{\tilde{F}_i})$ is log bounded where $\Sigma_{\tilde{F}_i}$ is the pushdown of $\Sigma_{F_i'}$. Thus there is a log resolution $\overline{F}_i \to \tilde{F}_i$ of $(\tilde{F}_i, \Sigma_{\tilde{F}_i})$ such that if $\Sigma_{\overline{F}_i}$ is the sum of the reduced exceptional divisor of $\overline{F}_i \to \tilde{F}_i$ and the birational transform of $\Sigma_{\tilde{F}_i}$, then $(\overline{F}_i, \Sigma_{\overline{F}_i})$ is log smooth and log bounded. Now we define a new boundary $\Gamma_{F_i'}$ by letting its coefficients to be the same as those of $\Omega_{F_i'}$ except if D is a component of $\Theta^{\sim}_{F_i}$, then we let $\mu_D\Gamma_{F_i'} = 1-\epsilon'$. So $\Gamma_{F_i'} - \Omega_{F_i'} \geq 0$ and $\operatorname{Supp}\Gamma_{F_i'} = \operatorname{Supp}\Omega_{F_i'}$. Replacing F_i' with a higher resolution, we can assume the induced map $F_i' \dashrightarrow \overline{F}_i$ is a morphism. Let $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_i}$ be the pushdown of $\Gamma_{F_i'}$. Then $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_i} \leq \Sigma_{\overline{F}_i}$, hence $(\overline{F}_i, \Gamma_{\overline{F}_i})$ log smooth, log bounded, and ϵ'-lc.

Step 8. Let $M_{\overline{F}_i}$ be the pushdown of $M_{F_i'}$. The pair $(\overline{F}_i, \operatorname{Supp} M_{\overline{F}_i})$ is log bounded because $\operatorname{Supp} M_{\overline{F}_i} \subseteq \operatorname{Supp}\Gamma_{\overline{F}_i}$ as $\operatorname{Supp} M_{F_i'} \subseteq \operatorname{Supp}\Gamma_{F_i'}$. We show that the coefficients of $M_{\overline{F}_i}$ are bounded from above. There is a number b independent of i such that for each i we can pick an ample Cartier divisor $B_{\overline{F}_i}$ so that $bA_{\overline{F}_i} - B_{\overline{F}_i}$ is big where $A_{\overline{F}_i}$ is the pushdown of $A_{F_i'}$. Let $r = \dim F_i$ which we can assume to be independent of i, and let $B_{F_i'}$ be the pullback of $B_{\overline{F}_i}$. Then

$$M_{\overline{F}_i} \cdot B_{\overline{F}_i}^{r-1} = M_{F_i'} \cdot B_{F_i'}^{r-1} \leq \operatorname{vol}(M_{F_i'} + B_{F_i'}) \leq \operatorname{vol}(M_{F_i'} + bA_{F_i'}) \leq \operatorname{vol}((1+b)M_{F_i'})$$

because $A_{F_i'} \leq M_{F_i'}$. Therefore, $M_{\overline{F}_i} \cdot B_{\overline{F}_i}^{r-1}$ is bounded from above which implies the coefficients of $M_{\overline{F}_i}$ are bounded from above.

Step 9. Let $K_{F_i'} + \Lambda_{F_i'}$ be the pullback of $K_{F_i} + \Lambda_{F_i}$. Since $\Lambda_{F_i} \leq \Theta_{F_i}$, every component D of $\Lambda_{F_i'}$ with positive coefficient is either exceptional/F_i or a component of $\Theta^{\sim}_{F_i}$. Since

$(F_i', \Lambda_{F_i'})$ is sub-ϵ-lc, for such D we have

$$\mu_D \Lambda_{F_i'} \leq 1 - \epsilon < 1 - \epsilon' = \mu_D \Gamma_{F_i'}$$

hence we get $\Lambda_{F_i'} \leq \Gamma_{F_i'}$.

Let $K_{F_i'} + \Delta_{F_i'}$ be the pullback of $K_{F_i} + \Delta_{F_i}$. Let $\Delta_{\overline{F}_i}$ be the pushdown of $\Delta_{F_i'}$ and let $\Lambda_{\overline{F}_i}$ be the pushdown of $\Lambda_{F_i'}$. Define $I_{F_i'} := \Delta_{F_i'} - \Lambda_{F_i'}$ and let $I_{\overline{F}_i} = \Delta_{\overline{F}_i} - \Lambda_{\overline{F}_i}$ be its pushdown. Then

$$\Delta_{\overline{F}_i} = \Lambda_{\overline{F}_i} + I_{\overline{F}_i} \leq \Gamma_{\overline{F}_i} + I_{\overline{F}_i}.$$

Also note that if I_{F_i} is the pushdown of $I_{F_i'}$, then

$$I_{F_i} := \Delta_{F_i} - \Lambda_{F_i} \geq \Theta_{F_i} - \Lambda_{F_i} \geq 0$$

which means $I_{F_i'} \geq 0$ and $I_{\overline{F}_i} \geq 0$.

Step 10. Note that so far we have not used δ and the divisor N_i. Let $N_{F_i} := N_i|_{F_i}$ and let $J_{F_i} := \frac{1}{\delta} N_{F_i}$. Let D be a component of J_{F_i}. Since the coefficients of $\frac{1}{\delta} N_i$ are at least 1, by Lemma 3.10,

$$\mu_D(\Delta_{F_i} + J_{F_i}) \geq \mu_D(\Theta_{F_i} + J_{F_i}) \geq 1.$$

Thus $(F_i, \Delta_{F_i} + J_{F_i})$ is not klt, so $(F_i', \Delta_{F_i'} + J_{F_i'})$ is not sub-klt where $J_{F_i'} = J_{F_i}|_{F_i'}$. Let $J_{\overline{F}_i}$ be the pushdown of $J_{F_i'}$. Since $K_{F_i'} + \Delta_{F_i'} + J_{F_i'}$ is nef,

$$K_{F_i'} + \Delta_{F_i'} + J_{F_i'} \leq g_i^*(K_{\overline{F}_i} + \Delta_{\overline{F}_i} + J_{\overline{F}_i})$$

where g_i is the morphism $F_i' \to \overline{F}_i$. Thus $(\overline{F}_i, \Delta_{\overline{F}_i} + J_{\overline{F}_i})$ is not sub-klt. Let $L_{\overline{F}_i} := I_{\overline{F}_i} + J_{\overline{F}_i}$. Then $(\overline{F}_i, \Gamma_{\overline{F}_i} + L_{\overline{F}_i})$ is not klt because $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_i} + L_{\overline{F}_i} \geq \Delta_{\overline{F}_i} + J_{\overline{F}_i}$.

On the other hand, since

$$I_{F_i'} = \Delta_{F_i'} - \Lambda_{F_i'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (K_{X_i} + \Delta_i)|_{F_i'} - K_{X_i}|_{F_i'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -(n_i + 1) K_{X_i}|_{F_i'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \frac{n_i + 1}{m_i} M_{F_i'}$$

and since $J_{F_i'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{n_i}{m_i \delta} M_{F_i'}$, we get

$$L_{\overline{F}_i} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (\frac{n_i + 1}{m_i} + \frac{n_i}{m_i \delta}) M_{\overline{F}_i}.$$

Therefore, the coefficients of the right hand side get arbitrarily small when m_i grows large. This contradicts Proposition 4.2.

□

Proposition 4.5. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon, \delta \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$. Then there exists a number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on d, ϵ, and δ satisfying the following. Assume X is an ϵ-lc Fano variety of dimension d such that $K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ for some $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $B \geq 0$ with coefficients $\geq \delta$. Then $|-mK_X|$ defines a birational map.*

Proof. If the proposition is not true, then there is a sequence of Fano varieties X_i and $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors B_i satisfying the assumptions of the proposition but such that if $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$ is the smallest number so that $|-m_i K_{X_i}|$ defines a birational map, then the m_i form a strictly increasing sequence approaching ∞. Let $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ be the smallest number so that $\mathrm{vol}(-n_i K_{X_i}) > (2d)^d$. By Proposition 4.4, there is a number v independent of i such that $\frac{m_i}{n_i} < v$. Therefore, $\mathrm{vol}(-m_i K_{X_i})$ is bounded from above because we can assume $n_i > 1$ hence

$$\mathrm{vol}(-m_i K_{X_i}) = (\frac{m_i}{n_i - 1})^d \mathrm{vol}(-(n_i - 1) K_{X_i}) \leq (\frac{m_i}{n_i - 1})^d (2d)^d.$$

Let $\phi_i \colon W_i \to X_i$ be a resolution so that $\phi_i^*(-m_i K_{X_i}) \sim A_{W_i} + R_{W_i}$ with A_{W_i} base point free and R_{W_i} the fixed part of $\phi_i^*(-m_i K_{X_i})$. We can assume A_{W_i} is general in its linear

system. We then get $m_iK_{X_i}+A_i+R_i\sim 0$ where A_i,R_i will denote the pushdowns of A_{W_i},R_{W_i}. Let E_{W_i} be the sum of the reduced exceptional divisor of ϕ_i and the support of the birational transform of R_i. Define $\Sigma_{W_i}=E_{W_i}+A_{W_i}$. Then, by Lemma 2.30,

$$K_{W_i}+\Sigma_{W_i}+2(2d+1)A_{W_i}$$

is big. Moreover its volume is bounded from above because

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{vol}(K_{X_i}+\Sigma_i+2(2d+1)A_i)&\leq \operatorname{vol}(K_{X_i}+R_i+(4d+3)A_i)\\ &\leq \operatorname{vol}((4d+3)R_i+(4d+3)A_i)\leq \operatorname{vol}(-(4d+3)m_iK_{X_i})\end{aligned}$$

where Σ_i is the pushdown of Σ_{W_i}. Therefore, (W_i,Σ_{W_i}) is log birationally bounded by [15, Lemmas 3.2 and 2.4.2(4)]. More precisely, if $W_i\to\tilde{W}_i$ is the contraction defined by A_{W_i}, then $(\tilde{W}_i,\Sigma_{\tilde{W}_i})$ is log bounded. Thus perhaps after replacing W_i there is a log resolution $\overline{W}_i\to\tilde{W}_i$ of $(\tilde{W}_i,\Sigma_{\tilde{W}_i})$ such that the induced map $W_i\to\overline{W}_i$ is a morphism and $(\overline{W}_i,\Sigma_{\overline{W}_i})$ is log smooth and log bounded where $\Sigma_{\overline{W}_i}$ is the pushdown of Σ_{W_i}.

Let $K_{W_i}+\Lambda_{W_i}$ be the pullback of K_{X_i} and let $K_{\overline{W}_i}+\Lambda_{\overline{W}_i}$ be its pushdown on $\overline{W}_i$. The crepant pullback of

$$K_{X_i}+\Delta_i:=K_{X_i}+\frac{1}{m_i}A_i+\frac{1}{m_i}R_i\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$$

to $\overline{W}_i$ is

$$K_{\overline{W}_i}+\Delta_{\overline{W}_i}:=K_{\overline{W}_i}+\Lambda_{\overline{W}_i}+\frac{1}{m_i}A_{\overline{W}_i}+\frac{1}{m_i}R_{\overline{W}_i}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$$

where $A_{\overline{W}_i}$ and $R_{\overline{W}_i}$ are pushdowns of A_{W_i} and R_{W_i}. Note that the coefficients of $\Lambda_{\overline{W}_i}$ are at most $1-\epsilon$ and the support of $\Delta_{\overline{W}_i}$ is inside $\Sigma_{\overline{W}_i}$. On the other hand, since $\operatorname{vol}(A_{W_i}+R_{W_i})$ is bounded from above, one can show the coefficients of $A_{\overline{W}_i}+R_{\overline{W}_i}$ are bounded from above by calculating intersection numbers as in Step 8 of the proof of Proposition 4.4. So if m_i is sufficiently large, then the coefficients of $\frac{1}{m_i}A_{\overline{W}_i}+\frac{1}{m_i}R_{\overline{W}_i}$ are sufficiently small. Therefore, if we pick $\epsilon'\in(0,\epsilon)$, then there is a boundary $\Gamma_{\overline{W}_i}$ supported on $\Sigma_{\overline{W}_i}$ such that $(\overline{W}_i,\Gamma_{\overline{W}_i})$ is ϵ'-lc and such that $\Delta_{\overline{W}_i}\leq\Gamma_{\overline{W}_i}$ for $i\gg 0$.

Now let $L_i:=\frac{1}{\delta}B_i$ which has coefficients ≥ 1. Then (X_i,Δ_i+L_i) is not klt and $K_{X_i}+\Delta_i+L_i$ is ample. Therefore, if $L_{\overline{W}_i}$ is the pushdown of $L_i|_{W_i}$, then $(\overline{W}_i,\Delta_{\overline{W}_i}+L_{\overline{W}_i})$ is not sub-klt which in turn implies $(\overline{W}_i,\Gamma_{\overline{W}_i}+L_{\overline{W}_i})$ is not klt. This contradicts Proposition 4.2 because $L_{\overline{W}_i}\sim_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{1}{\delta m_i}A_{\overline{W}_i}+\frac{1}{\delta m_i}R_{\overline{W}_i}$.

□

4.6. **Effective birationality for nearly canonical Fano varieties.**

Proposition 4.7. *Let $d\in\mathbb{N}$. Then there exist numbers $\tau\in(0,1)$ and $m\in\mathbb{N}$ depending only on d satisfying the following. If X is a τ-lc Fano variety of dimension d, then $|-mK_X|$ defines a birational map.*

Proof. Step 1. If the proposition does not hold, then there is a sequence X_i of Fano varieties of dimension d and an increasing sequence ϵ_i of numbers in $(0,1)$ approaching 1 such that X_i is ϵ_i-lc and if $m_i\in\mathbb{N}$ is the smallest number such that $|-m_iK_{X_i}|$ defines a birational map, then the m_i form an increasing sequence approaching ∞. Let $n_i\in\mathbb{N}$ be the smallest number so that $\operatorname{vol}(-n_iK_X)>(2d)^d$. First we want to show $\frac{m_i}{n_i}$ is bounded from above. Assume this is not the case , so we can assume the $\frac{m_i}{n_i}$ form an increasing sequence approaching ∞. We will derive a contradiction by the end of Step 4.

We apply Steps 1-9 of the proof of Proposition 4.4 in our situation. Recall that those steps did not use δ and the N_i. We use the notation and assumptions made in those steps.

Step 2. By Lemma 3.11, (F_i, Λ_{F_i}) is sub-ϵ_i-lc. Pick $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ so that $\epsilon < \epsilon_i$ for every i. Assume (F_i, Δ_{F_i}) is not ϵ-lc for any i. Then for each i, there is a prime divisor D_i on some birational model of F_i such that $a(D_i, F_i, \Delta_{F_i}) < \epsilon$. Replacing F_i' we can assume D_i is a divisor on F_i'. By assumption, $\mu_{D_i}\Delta_{F_i'} > 1-\epsilon$, and since (F_i, Λ_{F_i}) is ϵ_i-lc, $\mu_{D_i}\Lambda_{F_i'} \leq 1-\epsilon_i$. So

$$\mu_{D_i} I_{F_i'} = \mu_{D_i}(\Delta_{F_i'} - \Lambda_{F_i'}) > \epsilon_i - \epsilon$$

which is bounded from below. Therefore, if c is a sufficiently large number, then $(F_i, \Delta_{F_i} + cI_{F_i})$ is not klt for every i as we can assume $\mu_{D_i}(\Delta_{F_i'} + cI_{F_i'}) > 1$. Moreover, $K_{F_i} + \Delta_{F_i} + cI_{F_i}$ is ample. Thus $(\overline{F}_i, \Delta_{\overline{F}_i} + cI_{\overline{F}_i})$ is not sub-klt for every i. Letting $L_{F_i} := (c+1)I_{F_i}$, the pair $(\overline{F}_i, \Gamma_{\overline{F}_i} + L_{\overline{F}_i})$ is not klt for every i because

$$\Delta_{\overline{F}_i} + cI_{\overline{F}_i} \leq \Gamma_{\overline{F}_i} + L_{\overline{F}_i}$$

where $L_{\overline{F}_i}$ is the pushdown of $L_{F_i'} = L_{F_i}|_{F_i'}$. We get a contradiction by Proposition 4.2 as $L_{\overline{F}_i} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(c+1)(n_i+1)}{m_i} M_{\overline{F}_i}$ and as the coefficients of the right hand side approach 0 when i goes to ∞. Therefore, from now on we can assume (F_i, Δ_{F_i}) is ϵ-lc for every i. Note that the above arguments show (F_i, Δ_{F_i}) is ϵ-lc for any choice of $P_{F_i} \geq 0$ in its $\mathbb{R}$-linear equivalence class.

Now since the ϵ_i approach 1, we can choose ϵ close enough to 1 so that $1-\epsilon < s$ for any $0 < s \in \Phi$ where Φ is the DCC set to which the coefficients of Θ_{F_i} belong. In particular, $\Lambda_{F_i} \leq 0$ for every i otherwise if D_i is a component of Λ_{F_i} with positive coefficient, then from $\Lambda_{F_i} \leq \Theta_{F_i} \leq \Delta_{F_i}$ we deduce $\mu_{D_i}\Delta_{F_i} > 1-\epsilon$ contradicting the ϵ-lc property of (F_i, Δ_{F_i}).

Step 3. By construction,

$$K_{\overline{F}_i} + \Lambda_{\overline{F}_i} + \frac{1}{m_i} M_{\overline{F}_i} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$$

Moreover, any component of $\Lambda_{\overline{F}_i}$ with positive coefficient is exceptional$/F_i$, hence a component of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_i}$, and its coefficient in $\Lambda_{\overline{F}_i}$ is at most $1-\epsilon_i$. So the coefficients of $(\Lambda_{\overline{F}_i} + \frac{1}{m_i} M_{\overline{F}_i})^{\geq 0}$ get arbitrarily small as i gets large. As $(\overline{F}_i, \operatorname{Supp} \Gamma_{\overline{F}_i})$ is log bounded and

$$\operatorname{Supp}(\Lambda_{\overline{F}_i} + \frac{1}{m_i} M_{\overline{F}_i})^{\geq 0} \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} \Gamma_{\overline{F}_i},$$

we can assume $K_{\overline{F}_i}$ is pseudo-effective for every i, by Lemma 2.21.

First assume $\kappa_\sigma(K_{\overline{F}_i}) > 0$ for every i. Then for each number q there is a number p such that $\operatorname{vol}(pK_{\overline{F}_i} + A_{\overline{F}_i}) > q$ for every i, by Lemma 2.24. This in turn gives $\operatorname{vol}(pK_{F_i} + A_{F_i}) > q$. Therefore, both sides of the inequality

$$\operatorname{vol}(\frac{m_i}{n_i}(K_{F_i} + \Delta_{F_i}) + A_{F_i}) \geq \operatorname{vol}(\frac{m_i}{n_i} K_{F_i} + A_{F_i})$$

go to ∞ as i goes to ∞. But

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{vol}(\frac{m_i}{n_i}(K_{F_i} + \Delta_{F_i}) + A_{F_i}) &= \operatorname{vol}(\frac{m_i}{n_i}(-n_i K_{X_i})|_{F_i} + A_{F_i}) \\ &\leq \operatorname{vol}((-m_i K_{X_i} + A_i)|_{F_i}) \leq \operatorname{vol}((-2m_i K_{X_i})|_{F_i}) \end{aligned}$$

and the right hand side is bounded from above, a contradiction. Thus from now on we can assume $\kappa_\sigma(K_{\overline{F}_i}) = 0$ for every i.

Step 4. Since $\kappa_\sigma(K_{\overline{F}_i}) = 0$, there is $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h^0(rK_{\overline{F}_i}) \neq 0$ for every i, by Lemma 2.19. Then $h^0(rK_{F_i}) \neq 0$ for every i, hence $rK_{F_i} \sim T_{F_i}$ for some integral divisor $T_{F_i} \geq 0$. First assume $T_{F_i} \neq 0$ for every i. Then $r(K_{F_i} + \Delta_{F_i}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} Q_{F_i} := r\Delta_{F_i} + T_{F_i}$. Thus

$$(r+1)(K_{F_i} + \Delta_{F_i}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_{F_i} + \Delta_{F_i} + Q_{F_i}$$

and $(F_i, \Delta_{F_i} + Q_{F_i})$ is not klt as $Q_{F_i} \geq T_{F_i}$. Therefore, letting $L_{F_i} := I_{F_i} + Q_{F_i}$, noting $L_{\overline{F}_i} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (\frac{n_i+1}{m_i} + \frac{rn_i}{m_i})M_{\overline{F}_i}$, and arguing similar to Step 2 we get a contradiction.

Now we can assume $T_{F_i} = 0$ for every i. Then

$$h^0(-rK_{X_i}|_{F_i}) = h^0(-r(K_{F_i} + \Lambda_{F_i})) = h^0(-r\Lambda_{F_i}) \neq 0$$

for every i because $\Lambda_{F_i} \leq 0$. Thus by Step 2 and Proposition 3.13, perhaps after replacing r with a multiple, $h^0(-n_i rK_{X_i}) \neq 0$ for every i. Then $n_i K_{X_i} + N_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ for some $N_i \geq 0$ with coefficients $\geq \frac{1}{r}$. We can then apply Proposition 4.4 to deduce that $\frac{m_i}{n_i}$ is bounded from above, a contradiction.

Step 5. The volume $\operatorname{vol}(-m_i K_{X_i})$ is bounded from above because for each i either $n_i = 1$ in which case m_i is bounded, or $n_i > 1$ in which case

$$\operatorname{vol}(-m_i K_{X_i}) = (\frac{m_i}{n_i - 1})^d \operatorname{vol}(-(n_i - 1)K_{X_i}) \leq (\frac{m_i}{n_i - 1})^d (2d)^d$$

is bounded from above. Recall that $\phi_i \colon W_i \to X_i$ is a resolution so that $\phi_i^*(-m_i K_{X_i}) \sim A_{W_i} + R_{W_i}$ with A_{W_i} base point free and R_{W_i} the fixed part of $\phi_i^*(-m_i K_{X_i})$. We can assume A_{W_i} is general in its linear system. Since $\operatorname{vol}(-m_i K_{X_i})$ is bounded from above, as in the proof Proposition 4.5, we can assume there exist log bounded log smooth pairs $(\overline{W}_i, \Sigma_{\overline{W}_i})$ and birational morphisms $W_i \to \overline{W}_i$ so that $\operatorname{Supp} \Sigma_{\overline{W}_i}$ contains the exceptional divisors of $\overline{W}_i \dashrightarrow X_i$ and the support of $A_{\overline{W}_i} + R_{\overline{W}_i}$, the pushdown of $A_{W_i} + R_{W_i}$. Moreover, the coefficients of $A_{\overline{W}_i} + R_{\overline{W}_i}$ are bounded from above.

Let $K_{W_i} + \Lambda_{W_i}$ be the pullback of K_{X_i} and let $K_{\overline{W}_i} + \Lambda_{\overline{W}_i}$ be its pushdown on $\overline{W}_i$. The crepant pullback of $K_{X_i} + \frac{1}{m_i}A_i + \frac{1}{m_i}R_i$ to $\overline{W}_i$ is

$$K_{\overline{W}_i} + \Lambda_{\overline{W}_i} + \frac{1}{m_i}A_{\overline{W}_i} + \frac{1}{m_i}R_{\overline{W}_i} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0.$$

Note that the coefficients of $\Lambda_{\overline{W}_i}$ are at most $1 - \epsilon_i$ which are either negative or approach 0 as i goes to ∞. So if i is sufficiently large, then the coefficients of $(\Lambda_{\overline{W}_i} + \frac{1}{m_i}A_{\overline{W}_i} + \frac{1}{m_i}R_{\overline{W}_i})^{\geq 0}$ are sufficiently small. Thus $K_{\overline{W}_i}$ is pseudo-effective for every $i \gg 0$, by Lemma 2.21. This is a contradiction because K_{W_i} is not pseudo-effective hence $K_{\overline{W}_i}$ is not pseudo-effective for every i. Therefore, m_i is bounded as required.

□

5. **Proof of Theorem 1.4**

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(X, B), \Delta, G, F, \Theta_F$, and P_F be as in Theorem 3.9 where G is not necessarily a general member of a covering family. Assume X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial near the generic point of G, P_F is big, and $(X, B + \Delta)$ has a non-klt centre intersecting G. Then for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we can choose $P_F \geq 0$ so that $(F, \Theta_F + P_F)$ is not ϵ-lc.*

Proof. Recall $(Y, \Gamma_Y + N_Y)$ and $(S, \Gamma_S + N_S)$ of the proof of Lemma 3.10. Let $I \neq G$ be a maximal non-klt centre intersecting G. We can assume some component of $\lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - S$ maps onto I. Let $x \in I \cap G$ be a closed point. Since $\lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor$ is the non-klt locus of $(Y, \Gamma_Y + N_Y)$, by the connectedness principle, $\lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor$ is connected near the fibre of $Y \to X$ over x. Thus

some component of $\lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - S$ intersects the fibre of $S \to G$ over x, hence $(\lfloor \Gamma_Y \rfloor - S)|_S \neq 0$ which is vertical over F which in turn implies $(S, \Gamma_S + N_S)$ has a divisorial non-klt centre vertical over F. Therefore, by Lemma 3.7, there is a resolution $F' \to F$ such that if $\Omega_{F'}$ and $R_{F'}$ are the discriminant and moduli parts of adjuction on F' for $(S, \Gamma_S + N_S)$ over F, then $\Omega_{F'}$ has a coefficient ≥ 1 and $R_{F'}$ is pseudo-effective. Since $\Omega_F \geq \Theta_F$ and since P_F is big, taking an average $(1-t)(\Omega_F + R_F) + t(\Theta_F + P_F)$ for some small $t \in (0,1)$ we can find $P_F \geq 0$ in its $\mathbb{R}$-linear equivalence class so that $(F, \Theta_F + P_F)$ is not ϵ-lc.

□

Proposition 5.2. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon, \delta \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$. Then there is a number v depending only on d, ϵ, and δ such that for any X as in Theorem 1.4 we have* $\mathrm{vol}(-K_X) < v$.

Proof. Step 1. If the statement is not true, then there is a sequence of pairs (X_i, B_i) satisfying the properties listed in Theorem 1.4 such that $\mathrm{vol}(-K_{X_i})$ is an increasing sequence approaching ∞. Taking a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorialisation we can assume X_i is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Note that X_i is Fano type. Run an MMP on $-K_{X_i} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} B_i$ and let X_i' be the resulting model. Since B_i is big, $-K_{X_i'}$ is nef and big, and since $K_{X_i} + B_i \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$, (X_i', B_i') is ϵ-lc. Thus if $X_i' \to X_i''$ is the contraction defined by $-K_{X_i'}$, then X_i'' is a Fano. Replacing (X_i, B_i) with (X_i'', B_i''), we can assume X_i is Fano. Moreover, modifying B_i, we can assume it is a $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary. By Proposition 4.5, there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|-mK_{X_i}|$ defines a birational map for every i. Let $\phi_i \colon W_i \to X_i$ be a resolution so that $\phi^*(-mK_{X_i})$ decomposes as the sum of a base point free part A_{W_i} and fixed part R_{W_i}. Since $\mathrm{vol}(-K_{X_i})$ is an increasing sequence approaching ∞, there is a strictly decreasing sequence $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$ approaching 0 so that $\mathrm{vol}(-a_i K_{X_i}) > (2d)^d$ for each i.

Step 2. In this paragraph, fix i. Applying 2.16 (2), there exists a covering family of subvarieties of X_i such that for each pair of general closed points $x_i, y_i \in X_i$ there exist a general member G_i of the family and a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $0 \leq \Delta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -a_i K_{X_i}$ such that (X_i, Δ_i) is lc at x_i with a unique non-klt place whose centre contains x_i, that centre is G_i, and (X_i, Δ_i) is not lc at y_i. Recall from 2.12 that such G_i are among the general fibres of finitely many morphisms $V^j \to T^j$, and we can assume for each j the points on T^j corresponding to the G_i are dense. Since $K_{X_i} + \Delta_i$ is anti-ample, by the connectedness principle, $\dim G_i > 0$. Let $b_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ be the smallest number so that $\mathrm{vol}(-b_i K_{X_i}|_{G_i}) \geq d^d + 1$ for all the G_i; we can assume equality is obtained on a subfamily of the G_i which are general fibres of one of the morphisms $V^j \to T^j$.

Assume b_i is not bounded from below, so we can assume b_i is a strictly decreasing sequence approaching 0. Applying the second paragraph of 2.16 (2), replacing a_i with $a_i + (d-1)b_i$ and replacing the Δ_i, we can replace each G_i with one having smaller dimension. Introducing new b_i as above and repeating the process leads us to the case when b_i is bounded from below otherwise we get the case $\dim G_i = 0$ which is not possible as mentioned above.

In order to get a contradiction, for each i, it is enough to consider a sub-family of the G_i satisfying $\mathrm{vol}(-b_i K_{X_i}|_{G_i}) = d^d + 1$ and which are general fibres of one of the morphisms $V^j \to T^j$. *From now on when we mention G_i we mean one of those.* In particular, $\mathrm{vol}(-K_{X_i}|_{G_i})$ is bounded from above as b_i is bounded from below.

Step 3. For each i pick a general G_i as in the last paragraph, and let F_i be its normalisation. Let $F_i' \to F_i$ be a resolution so that $F_i' \dashrightarrow W_i$ is a morphism. Since $\mathrm{vol}(-K_{X_i}|_{G_i})$ is bounded from above, the volume of $A_{F_i'} := A_{W_i}|_{F_i'}$ is also bounded from above. By Theorem 3.9, there is a $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary Θ_{F_i} with coefficients in a fixed DCC set Φ depending

only on d such that we can write

$$(K_{X_i}+\Delta_i)|_{F_i}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_{F_i}+\Delta_{F_i}:=K_{F_i}+\Theta_{F_i}+P_{F_i}$$

where we can assume $P_{F_i}\geq$ is big. Let $M_i:=\frac{1}{\delta}B_i$ and pick $\epsilon'\in(0,\epsilon)$ such that $\epsilon'<\min\Phi^{>0}$. Define a boundary $\Omega_{F_i'}$ as in Step 5 of the proof of Proposition 4.4 using the same notation. Then $K_{F_i'}+\Omega_{F_i'}$ is big and the coefficients of Ω_{F_i} belong to $\{\epsilon',\frac{1}{2},1-\epsilon'\}$.

We can show $\mathrm{vol}(K_{F_i'}+\Omega_{F_i'})$ is bounded from above similar to Step 6 of the proof of 4.4 by noting that

$$\mathrm{vol}(K_{F_i}+\Delta_{F_i}+5dmM_{F_i})=\mathrm{vol}(-(a_i-1+\frac{5dm}{\delta})K_{X_i}|_{F_i})$$

is bounded from above, and by showing $\Delta_{F_i}+5dmM_{F_i}-\Omega_{F_i}$ is big. Moreover, as in Step 7 of the proof of 4.4, letting $\Sigma_{F_i'}=\mathrm{Supp}\,\Omega_{F_i'}$, we can show $\mathrm{vol}(K_{F_i'}+\Sigma_{F_i'}+2(2d+1)A_{F_i'})$ is bounded from above and deduce (F_i',Ω'_{F_i}) is log birationally bounded as $\mathrm{vol}(A_{F_i'})$ is bounded. Therefore, we can assume we have birational morphisms $F_i'\to\overline{F}_i$ so that if $\Omega_{\overline{F}_i}$ is the pushdown of $\Omega_{F_i'}$, then $(\overline{F}_i,\Omega_{\overline{F}_i})$ is log smooth and log bounded. We define a new boundary $\Gamma_{F_i'}$ by letting its coefficients to be the same as those of $\Omega_{F_i'}$ except if D is a component of $\Theta^{\sim}_{F_i}$ we set the coefficient $\mu_D\Gamma_{F_i'}$ to be $1-\epsilon'$. Let $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_i}$ be the pushdown of $\Gamma_{F_i'}$.

Step 4. By the connectedness principle, the non-klt locus of (X_i,Δ_i) is connected. Since (X_i,Δ_i) is not lc at some point, the pair has a non-klt centre intersecting G_i but not equal to G_i. By Lemma 5.1, we can choose $P_{F_i}\geq 0$ so that (F_i,Δ_{F_i}) is not ϵ'-lc, hence we can assume $\Delta_{F_i'}$ has a component D_i with coefficient $>1-\epsilon'$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.11, $(F_i',\Lambda_{F_i'})$ is sub-ϵ-lc where $K_{F_i'}+\Lambda_{F_i'}=K_{X_i}|_{F_i'}$. Thus letting $I_{F_i'}:=\Delta_{F_i'}-\Lambda_{F_i'}$ we see that $\mu_{D_i}I_{F_i'}>\epsilon-\epsilon'$. Therefore, there is c such that $(F_i,\Delta_{F_i}+cI_{F_i})$ is not klt for every i. Note that by Lemma 3.11, $\Lambda_{F_i}\leq\Theta_{F_i}\leq\Delta_{F_i}$, so $I_{F_i}\geq 0$.

Now since $(X_i,B_i+\Delta_i)$ has a unique non-klt place with centre G_i, by Lemma 3.11, (F_i,B_{F_i}) is sub-ϵ-lc where $K_{F_i}+B_{F_i}=(K_{X_i}+B_i)|_{F_i}$. Note that $B_{F_i}=\Lambda_{F_i}+B_i|_{F_i}$. Moreover,

$$B_{F_i}+(1+c)I_{F_i}=\Lambda_{F_i}+B_i|_{F_i}+\Delta_{F_i}-\Lambda_{F_i}+cI_{F_i}=\Delta_{F_i}+cI_{F_i}+B_i|_{F_i}$$

hence $(F_i,B_{F_i}+(1+c)I_{F_i})$ is not klt. In addition, $K_{F_i}+B_{F_i}+(1+c)I_{F_i}$ is ample because $K_{F_i}+B_{F_i}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$ and

$$I_{F_i}=K_{F_i}+\Delta_{F_i}-(K_{F_i}+\Lambda_{F_i})\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}(K_{X_i}+\Delta_i-K_{X_i})|_{F_i}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}-a_iK_{X_i}|_{F_i}$$

is ample.

On the other hand, since $\Lambda_{F_i}\leq\Theta_{F_i}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Supp}(B_{F_i})^{\geq 0}\subseteq\mathrm{Supp}(\Theta_{F_i}+B_i|_{F_i}).$$

Thus if $K_{F_i'}+B_{F_i'}$ and $K_{\overline{F}_i}+B_{\overline{F}_i}$ are the crepant pullbacks of $K_{F_i}+B_{F_i}$ to F_i' and $\overline{F}_i$, then by the sub-ϵ-lc property of $(F_i',B_{F_i'})$ and the construction of $\Gamma_{F_i'}$, we get $B_{F_i'}\leq\Gamma_{F_i'}$ which in turn gives $B_{\overline{F}_i}\leq\Gamma_{\overline{F}_i}$. Therefore, $(\overline{F}_i,\Gamma_{\overline{F}_i}+(1+c)I_{\overline{F}_i})$ is not klt as $(\overline{F}_i,B_{\overline{F}_i}+(1+c)I_{\overline{F}_i})$ is not sub-klt where $I_{\overline{F}_i}$ is the pushdown of $I_{F_i'}$.

Finally, $I_{F_i'}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}a_iB_i|_{F_i'}$ and the pushdown of $B_i|_{F_i'}$ on $\overline{F}_i$ is supported on $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_i}$ and has bounded coefficients by noting $B_i|_{F_i'}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}\frac{1}{m}(A_{W_i}+R_{W_i})|_{F_i'}$ and calculating intersection numbers as in Step 8 of the proof of Proposition 4.4. Therefore, we can apply Proposition 4.2 to get a contradiction.

□

Proof. (of Theorem 1.4) Taking a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorialisation we can assume X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Run an MMP on $-K_X$ and let X' be the resulting model. Since B is big, $-K_{X'}$ is nef and big, that is, X' is a weak Fano. It is enough to show such X' are bounded because then there is a klt n-complement of $K_{X'}$ which in turn gives a klt n-complement of K_X for some n independent of X, hence we can apply [16, Theorem 1.3]. So replacing X with X' we can assume X is weak Fano. Now $-K_X$ defines a birational contraction $X \to X''$ and replacing X with X'' we can assume X is Fano. Pick $\epsilon' \in (0, \epsilon)$. Let $\Delta = (1+t)B$ for some $t > 0$ so that (X, Δ) is ϵ'-lc. By [14, Theorem 1.6], it is enough to show (X, Δ) is log birationally bounded which is equivalent to showing (X, B) is log birationally bounded.

By Proposition 4.5, there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on d, ϵ, δ such that $|-mK_X|$ defines a birational map. Let $\phi\colon W \to X$ be a log resolution so that $\phi^*(-mK_X)$ decomposes as the sum of a base point free A_W and fixed part R_W. By Proposition 5.2, $\mathrm{vol}(-K_X)$ is bounded from above, hence $\mathrm{vol}(A_W)$ is bounded from above. Let Σ_W be the sum of the reduced exceptional divisor of ϕ and the support of the birational transform of B. Then $\mathrm{vol}(K_W + \Sigma_W + 2(2d+1)A_W)$ is bounded from above because

$$\mathrm{vol}(K_X + \Sigma + 2(2d+1)A) \leq \mathrm{vol}(K_X + \frac{1}{\delta}B + 2(2d+1)A) \leq \mathrm{vol}(-rK_X)$$

for some r depending only on d, δ, m where Σ and A are the pushdowns of Σ_W and A_W. Therefore, (W, Σ_W) is log birationally bounded by [15, Lemmas 3.2 and 2.4.2(4)] which implies (X, B) is also log birationally bounded as required.

□

6. **Boundedness of complements**

In this section we develop the theory of complements for generalised pairs following [37][35][34]. We prove various inductive statements before we come to the main result of this section (6.13).

6.1. **General remarks.** Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a projective generalised pair with data $\phi\colon X \to X'$ and M.

(1) Assume there is $B'^+ \geq B'$ such that $(X', B'^+ + M')$ is generalised lc, nM is Cartier, and $n(K_{X'} + B'^+ + M') \sim 0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We show $K_{X'} + B'^+ + M'$ is an n-complement of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$. Writing $B' = T' + \Delta'$ where $T' = \lfloor B' \rfloor$, we need to show $nB'^+ \geq nT' + \lfloor (n+1)\Delta' \rfloor$. Let D' be a prime divisor and b' and b'^+ be its coefficients in B' and B'^+. If $b'^+ = 1$, then either $b' = 1$ in which case $nb'^+ = nb'$, or $b' < 1$ in which case $nb'^+ = n \geq \lfloor (n+1)b' \rfloor$. So assume $b'^+ < 1$, say $b'^+ = \frac{i}{n}$. Then

$$nb'^+ = i = \left\lfloor (n+1)b'^+ \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor (n+1)b' \right\rfloor.$$

(2) Assume $X' \dashrightarrow X''$ is a birational map to a normal projective variety. Replacing X we can assume the induced map $\psi\colon X \dashrightarrow X''$ is a morphism. Let $M'' = \psi_* M$ and assume

$$\phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + M') + P = \psi^*(K_{X''} + B'' + M'')$$

for some $P \geq 0$ and $B'' \geq 0$. Suppose $K_{X''} + B'' + M''$ has an n-complement $K_{X''} + B''^+ + M''$ with $B''^+ \geq B''$. We claim $K_{X'} + B' + M'$ has an n-complement $K_{X'} + B'^+ + M'$ with $B'^+ \geq B'$. Let $C'' = B''^+ - B''$, let $C' = \phi_*(P + \psi^* C'')$, and let $B'^+ = B' + C'$. Then $n(K_{X'} + B'^+ + C') \sim 0$ and

$$\phi^*(K_{X'} + B'^+ + M') = \psi^*(K_{X''} + B''^+ + M'')$$

hence $(X', B'^+ + C')$ is generalised lc. Now apply (1).

(3) Assume $X' \dashrightarrow X''$ is a partial MMP on $-(K_{X'}+B'+M')$ and B'', M'' are the pushdowns of B', M'. Then there is $P \geq 0$ as in (2). Thus if $K_{X''}+B''+M''$ has an n-complement $K_{X''}+B''^{+}+M''$ with $B''^{+} \geq B''$, then $K_{X'}+B'+M'$ has an n-complement $K_{X'}+B'^{+}+M'$ with $B'^{+} \geq B'$.

6.2. **Hyperstandard coefficients under adjunction for fibre spaces.** The existence of $\mathfrak{S}$ in the next result is similar to [34, Lemma 9.3(i)].

Proposition 6.3. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathfrak{R} \subset [0,1]$ be a finite set of rational numbers. Assume Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d. Then there exist $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite set of rational numbers $\mathfrak{S} \subset [0,1]$ depending only on $d, \mathfrak{R}$ satisfying the following. Assume (X,B) is a pair and $f\colon X \to Z$ a contraction such that*

- *(X,B) is projective lc of dimension d, and $\dim Z > 0$,*
- *$K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$ and $B \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$,*
- *X is Fano type over some non-empty open subset $U \subseteq Z$, and*
- *the generic point of each non-klt centre of (X,B) maps into U.*

Then we can write

$$q(K_X+B) \sim qf^*(K_Z+B_Z+M_Z)$$

where B_Z and M_Z are the discriminant and moduli parts of adjunction (as in 3.4), $B_Z \in \Phi(\mathfrak{S})$, and for any high resolution $Z' \to Z$ the moduli divisor $qM_{Z'}$ is nef Cartier.

Proof. Step 1. Let $q=n$ be the number given by Theorem 1.8 which depends only on $d, \mathfrak{R}$. Then there is a q-complement $K_X + B^+$ of $K_X + B$ over some point $z \in U$ with $B^+ \geq B$. Since over z we have $K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and $q(K_X+B^+) \sim 0$, and since $B^+ \geq B$, we have $B^+ = B$ near the generic fibre of f. Therefore, $q(K_X+B) \sim 0$ over the generic point of Z, hence there is a rational function α on X such that $qL := q(K_X+B) + \mathrm{Div}(\alpha)$ is zero over the generic point of Z. In particular, $q(K_X+B) \sim qL$ and L is vertical$/Z$. Since $L \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$, $L = f^*L_Z$ for some L_Z on Z. Let $M_Z := L_Z - (K_Z+B_Z)$ where B_Z is the discriminant part of adjunction for (X,B) over Z. Thus

$$q(K_X+B) \sim qL = qf^*L_Z = qf^*(K_Z+B_Z+M_Z)$$

and M_Z is the moduli part of adjunction for (X,B) over Z. Note that M_Z is not unique: it depends on the choice of α and K_Z.

Step 2. Our aim until the end of Step 3 is to show the existence of $\mathfrak{S}$ and to show qM_Z is integral. First we reduce these claims to the case $\dim Z = 1$. Assume $\dim Z > 1$. Let D be a prime divisor on Z. Let H be a general hyperplane section of Z and G its pullback to X. Let $K_G + B_G = (K_X + B + G)|_G$. Since G is a general member of a free linear system, each non-klt centre of (G, B_G) is a component of the intersection of a non-klt centre of (X,B) with G, hence its generic point maps into $U \cap H$. Moreover, G is Fano type over $U \cap H$. Let B_H be the discriminant part of adjunction for (G, B_G) over H. Let C be a component of $D \cap H$. Using inversion of adjunction one can show that $\mu_D B_Z = \mu_C B_H$ (cf. [4, proof of Lemma 3.2]). By Lemma 3.3, there is a finite set of rational numbers $\mathfrak{T} \subset [0,1]$ depending only on $\mathfrak{R}$ such that $B_G \in \Phi(\mathfrak{T})$. So applying induction on dimension, there is a finite set of rational numbers $\mathfrak{S} \subset [0,1]$ depending only on $d-1, \mathfrak{T}$ hence depending only on $d, \mathfrak{R}$ such that $B_H \in \Phi(\mathfrak{S})$. Therefore, $B_Z \in \Phi(\mathfrak{S})$.

Let g be the induced map $G \to H$. Pick a general $H' \sim H$ and let $K_H = (K_Z + H')|_H$ where the restriction is well-defined as H is a general hyperplane section, and K_H is

determined as a Weil divisor. Letting $M_H := (L_Z + H')|_H - (K_H + B_H)$, we have

$$q(K_G + B_G) \sim qg^*(K_H + B_H + M_H)$$

hence M_H is the moduli part of (G, B_G) over H. Moreover, $B_H + M_H = (B_Z + M_Z)|_H$, hence $\mu_C(B_H + M_H) = \mu_D(B_Z + M_Z)$ which implies $\mu_C M_H = \mu_D M_Z$ as $\mu_C B_H = \mu_D B_Z$. Therefore, $q\mu_D M_Z$ is integral iff $q\mu_C M_H$ is integral. So repeating the process we reduce the problem to the case $\dim Z = 1$.

Step 3. In this step we assume Z is a curve. By Lemma 2.5, X is Fano type over Z. Pick a closed point $z \in Z$. Let t be the lc threshold of f^*z with respect to (X, B). Let $\Gamma = B + tf^*z$ and let (X', Γ') be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt model of (X, Γ) so that $\lfloor \Gamma' \rfloor$ has a component mapping to z. Note that $K_{X'} + \Gamma' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z$. Then there is a boundary $B' \leq \Gamma'$ such that $B' \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$, $\lfloor B' \rfloor$ has a component mapping to z, and $B^\sim \leq B'$ where $B^\sim$ is the birational transform of B. Now X' is Fano type over Z and $-(K_{X'} + B') \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \Gamma' - B'/Z$. Run an MMP on $-(K_{X'} + B')$ over Z and let X'' be the resulting model. Then X'' is Fano type over Z, $B'' \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$, and $-(K_{X''} + B'')$ is nef over Z. Moreover, (X'', B'') is lc, as (X'', Γ'') is lc and $B'' \leq \Gamma''$. By our choice of q which comes from Theorem 1.8, $K_{X''} + B''$ has a q-complement $K_{X''} + B''^+$ over z with $B''^+ \geq B''$. Thus by the arguments of 6.1 in the relative setting, there is a q-complement $K_{X'} + B'^+$ of $K_{X'} + B'$ over z with $B'^+ \geq B'$. Pushing $K_{X'} + B'^+$ down to X gives a q-complement $K_X + B^+$ of $K_X + B$ over z with $B^+ \geq B$ such that (X, B^+) has a non-klt centre mapping to z. Now $B^+ - B \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ over z, hence $B^+ - B$ is vertical over Z. Thus over z, the divisor $B^+ - B$ is just a multiple of the fibre f^*z. Therefore, $B^+ = B + tf^*z$ over z as (X, B^+) has a non-klt centre mapping to z.

Recall that the coefficient of z in B_Z is $1 - t$. Pick a component S of f^*z and let b and b^+ be its coefficients in B and B^+. If m is its coefficient in f^*z, then $b^+ = b + tm$, hence $t = \frac{b^+ - b}{m}$. Now $b = 1 - \frac{r}{l}$ for some $r \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$, so $t = \frac{s}{m}$ where $s = b^+ - 1 + \frac{r}{l}$. If $b^+ = 1$, then $t = \frac{r}{lm}$. If $b^+ < 1$, then as $s \geq 0$ and as qb^+ is integral we get $1 - \frac{1}{l} \leq 1 - \frac{r}{l} \leq b^+ \leq \frac{q-1}{q}$, so $l \leq q$, hence there are finitely many possibilities for s. This proves the existence of $\mathfrak{S}$.

Now we show qM_Z is integral. By Step 1, $q(K_X + B) \sim 0$ over some non-empty open set $V \subseteq Z$ such that $\operatorname{Supp} B_Z \subseteq Z \setminus V$. Let $\Theta = B + \sum_{z \in Z \setminus V} t_z f^*z$ where t_z is the lc threshold of f^*z with respect to (X, B). If Θ_Z is the discriminant part of adjunction for (X, Θ) over Z, then $\Theta_Z = B_Z + \sum_{z \in Z \setminus V} t_z z$, hence Θ_Z is a reduced divisor. Moreover, by the above arguments, $K_X + \Theta$ is a q-complement of $K_X + B$ over each $z \in Z \setminus V$, hence $q(K_X + \Theta) \sim 0/Z$. Therefore, since

$$q(K_X + \Theta) = q(K_X + B) + q(\Theta - B)$$

$$\sim qf^*(K_Z + B_Z + M_Z) + qf^*(\Theta_Z - B_Z) = qf^*(K_Z + \Theta_Z + M_Z)$$

we deduce $q(K_Z + \Theta_Z + M_Z)$ is Cartier. This implies qM_Z is integral as $K_Z + \Theta_Z$ is integral.

Step 4. It remains to show $qM_{Z'}$ is nef Cartier where $Z' \to Z$ is a high resolution and $\dim Z$ is arbitrary. The nefness follows from Theorem 3.6, so we just need to show $qM_{Z'}$ is integral. Let $X' \to X$ be a log resolution of (X, B) so that $X' \dashrightarrow Z'$ is a morphism. Let $U_0 \subseteq U$ be an open set over which $Z' \to Z$ is an isomorphism. Let Δ' be the sum of the birational transform of B and the reduced exceptional divisor of $X' \to X$ but with all the components mapping outside U_0 removed. We can assume the generic point of any non-klt centre of (X', Δ') maps into U_0. Run an MMP on $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ over $Z' \times_Z X$ with scaling of some ample divisor. By [5, Theorem 1.9], the MMP terminates over $U_0' \subset Z'$, the inverse image of U_0. In fact we reach a model X'' such that over U_0' the pair (X'', Δ'') is a

$\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt model of (X,B), hence $K_{X''}+\Delta''\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ over U_0' and X'' is Fano type over U_0'. Now by [5, Theorem 1.4][14], we can run an MMP$/Z'$ on $K_{X''}+\Delta''$ which terminates with a good minimal model over Z' because the generic point of every non-klt centre of (X'',Δ'') is mapped into U_0'. Abusing notation, we denote the minimal model again by X'' which is Fano type over U_0'.

Let $f''\colon X''\to Z''/Z'$ be the contraction defined by $K_{X''}+\Delta''$. By construction, on a common resolution W of X and X'', the pullbacks of K_X+B and $K_{X''}+\Delta''$ are equal over $U_0''\subset Z''$, the inverse image of U_0. Let $K_{X''}+B''$ and L'' be the pushdown to X'' of the pullback of K_X+B and L to W, respectively. Let $P''=\Delta''-B''$ which is vertical and $\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ over Z'', hence it is the pullback of some $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $P_{Z''}$ on Z''. Denote by $\Delta_{Z''}$ the discriminant part of adjunction on Z'' defined for (X'',Δ'') over Z''. Then $\Delta_{Z''}=B_{Z''}+P_{Z''}$ where $B_{Z''}$ is the discriminant part of adjunction on Z'' defined for (X,B) over Z. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} q(K_{X''}+\Delta'') &= q(K_{X''}+B''+P'')\sim q(L''+P'')=qf''^*(L_{Z''}+P_{Z''})\\ &= qf''^*(K_{Z''}+\Delta_{Z''}+M_{Z''}) \end{aligned}$$

where $L_{Z''}$ is the pullback of L_Z in Step 1, and $M_{Z''}=L_{Z''}-(K_{Z''}+B_{Z''})$ is the moduli part of both (X'',Δ'') over Z'' and (X,B) over Z. Now by Steps 2-3, $qM_{Z''}$ is an integral divisor, hence $qM_{Z'}$ is integral as well which means it is Cartier as Z' is smooth. □

6.4. **Pulling back complements from the base of a fibration.**

Proposition 6.5. *Assume Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension $\leq d-1$ and Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d. Then Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension d for those $(X',B'+M')$ such that there is a contraction $X'\to V'$ so that $K_{X'}+B'+M'\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/V'$, $\dim V'>0$, and M' is not big$/V'$.*

Proof. Step 1. Replacing $(X',B'+M')$ with a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised dlt model as in 2.6(2) and applying 6.1(2), we can assume X' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Since M' is not big$/V'$, $X'\to V'$ is not birational. After running an MMP$/V'$ on M' and applying 6.1(2) once more, we can assume M' is semi-ample$/V'$. So $X'\to V'$ factors through a contraction $f'\colon X'\to T'$ such that $\dim X'>\dim T'$ and $M'\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/T'$.

By construction, $K_{X'}+B'\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/T'$, and by assumption X' is Fano type. Thus by Proposition 6.3 (which needs Theorem 1.8 in dimension d) there exist $q\in\mathbb{N}$ and a finite set of rational numbers $\mathfrak{S}\subset[0,1]$ depending only on $d,\mathfrak{R}$ such that

$$q(K_{X'}+B')\sim qf'^*(K_{T'}+B_{T'}+P_{T'})$$

where $B_{T'}$ and $P_{T'}$ are the discriminant and moduli divisors of adjunction for fibre spaces applied to (X',B') over T', and such that $B_{T'}\in\Phi(\mathfrak{S})$ and qP_T is nef Cartier for any high resolution $T\to T'$. We can assume q is divisible by p.

Step 2. Pick a sufficiently high resolution $\psi\colon T\to T'$ so that the moduli part P_T is nef and it satisfies the pullback property of Theorem 3.6 (ii). We consider $(T',B_{T'}+P_{T'})$ as a generalised pair with data $\psi\colon T\to T'$ and P_T. It is generalised lc because (X',B') is lc. Replace X so that the induced map $f\colon X\dashrightarrow T$ is a morphism. Since M is nef, $\phi^*M'=M+E$ for some exceptional$/X'$ and effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor E. Since $M'\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/T'$, E is vertical$/T'$, so there is a non-empty open subset of T' over which $E=0$ and $M\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Since X' is Fano type, the general fibres of f' are also Fano type, hence they are rationally connected which in turn implies the general fibres of f are rationally connected [13][40]. Thus perhaps after replacing X and T and applying Lemma 2.28, $pM\sim pf^*M_T$ for a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor M_T on T so that pM_T is nef Cartier. Moreover, since E is vertical and $\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ over T,

$E = f^*E_T$ for some effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor E_T. On the other hand, since E is exceptional$/X'$, applying [5, Lemma 3.2] to E over T' shows that E is very exceptional over T' which in turn implies E_T is exceptional over T'. In particular, this means $M_{T'} := \psi_* M_T$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier as $M_T + E_T \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/T'$. By construction, $q(P_T + M_T)$ is nef Cartier and $qM' \sim qf'^* M_{T'}$.

Step 3. Now we consider $(T', B_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'})$ as a generalised pair with data $\psi\colon T \to T'$ and $P_T + M_T$. We show it is is generalised lc. We can assume $(T, B_T + E_T)$ is log smooth where B_T is the discriminant divisor on T. By construction

$$K_T + B_T + E_T + P_T + M_T = \psi^*(K_{T'} + B_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'}).$$

So it is enough to show $(T, B_T + E_T)$ is sub-lc which in turn is equivalent to saying that every coefficient of $B_T + E_T$ is ≤ 1. Let $K_X + B$ be the pullback of $K_{X'} + B'$. Let D be a prime divisor on T. By definition of the discriminant divisor, $\mu_D B_T = 1 - t_D$ where t_D is the largest number so that $(X, B + t_D f^* D)$ is sub-lc over the generic point of D. Since $(X', B' + M')$ is generalised lc, $(X, B + E)$ is sub-lc, and since $E = f^* E_T$, we have $\mu_D E_T \leq t_D$ which implies $\mu_D B_T + \mu_D E_T \leq 1$.

Step 4. To summarise we have proved: $(T', B_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'})$ is generalised lc, $B_{T'} \in \Phi(\mathfrak{S})$, $q(P_T + M_T)$ is Cartier, and

$$q(K_{X'} + B' + M') \sim qf'^*(K_{T'} + B_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'})$$

is anti-nef. Moreover, T' is Fano type as X' is Fano type (this follows from [2]). Now by induction on dimension, $K_{T'} + B_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'}$ has an n-complement $K_{T'} + B^+_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'}$ for some n divisible by $qI(\mathfrak{S})$ and depending only on $\dim T', q, \mathfrak{S}$ such that $G_{T'} := B^+_{T'} - B_{T'} \geq 0$. So n depends only on $d, p, \mathfrak{R}$. Denote the pullback of $G_{T'}$ to T, X, X' by G_T, G, G' respectively. Let $B'^+ = B' + G'$. Then

$$n(K_{X'} + B'^+ + M') = n(K_{X'} + B' + M' + G')$$

$$\sim nf'^*(K_{T'} + B_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'} + G_{T'}) = nf'^*(K_{T'} + B^+_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'}) \sim 0.$$

Thus by 6.1(1), $K_{X'} + B'^+ + M'$ is an n-complement of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$ if we show $(X', B'^+ + M')$ is generalised lc.

Let C be a prime divisor on some birational model of X'. Replacing X, T we can assume C is a divisor on X and that its image on T is a divisor, say D. The pullback of $K_{X'} + B'^+ + M'$ to X is $K_X + B + E + G + M$. It is enough to show $\mu_C(B + E + G) \leq 1$. Since $(T', B^+_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'})$ is generalised lc, and since

$$K_T + B_T + E_T + G_T + P_T + M_T = \psi^*(K_{T'} + B^+_{T'} + P_{T'} + M_{T'})$$

we have $\mu_D(B_T + E_T + G_T) \leq 1$. Letting t_D be as in Step 3 we get $\mu_D(E_T + G_T) \leq t_D$ which implies $(X, B + E + G)$ is sub-lc over the generic point of D. Therefore, $\mu_C(B + E + G) \leq 1$ as required.

□

6.6. **Lifting complements from a non-klt centre.**

Proposition 6.7. *Assume Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension $d-1$. Then Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension d for those $(X', B' + M')$ such that*

- $B' \in \mathfrak{R}$,
- $(X', \Gamma' + \alpha M')$ *is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised plt for some Γ' and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,*
- $-(K_{X'} + \Gamma' + \alpha M')$ *is ample, and*
- $S' = \lfloor \Gamma' \rfloor$ *is irreducible and it is a component of $\lfloor B' \rfloor$.*

Proof. Step 1. The idea is to construct a complement on S' and then lift it to X'. We can assume the given map $\phi\colon X \to X'$ is a log resolution and that the induced map $\psi\colon S \dashrightarrow S'$ is a morphism where S is the birational transform of S'. By generalised adjunction we can write

$$K_{S'} + B_{S'} + M_{S'} = (K_{X'} + B' + M')|_{S'}.$$

By Lemma 3.3, $B_{S'} \in \Phi(\mathfrak{S})$ for some finite set of rational numbers $\mathfrak{S} \subset [0,1]$ which only depends on $p, \mathfrak{R}$. Restricting $K_{X'} + \Gamma' + \alpha M'$ to S' shows that S' is Fano type, by 2.6(5). On the other hand, $pM_S = pM|_S$ is Cartier. Thus by Theorem 1.9 in dimension $d-1$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ divisible by $pI(\mathfrak{S})$ which depends only on $d-1, p, \mathfrak{S}$ such that $K_{S'} + B_{S'} + M_{S'}$ has an n-complement $K_{S'} + B^+_{S'} + M_{S'}$ with $B^+_{S'} \geq B_{S'}$. Then n depends only on $d, p, \mathfrak{R}$ and replacing it with $nI(\mathfrak{R})$ we can assume it is divisible by $pI(\mathfrak{R})$. In particular, nB' is integral as $B' \in \mathfrak{R}$. We will show there is an n-complement $K_{X'} + B'^+ + M'$ of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$ with $B'^+ \geq B'$.

Step 2. Write

$$N := -(K_X + B + M) := -\phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + M')$$

and let $T = \lfloor B^{\geq 0} \rfloor$ and $\Delta = B - T$. Define

$$L := -nK_X - nT - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor - nM$$

which is an integral divisor. Note that

$$L = n\Delta - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor + nN.$$

Now write

$$K_X + \Gamma + \alpha M = \phi^*(K_{X'} + \Gamma' + \alpha M').$$

Replacing Γ' with $(1-a)\Gamma' + aB'$ and replacing αM with $((1-a)\alpha + a)M$ for some $a \in (0,1)$ sufficiently close to 1, we can assume α is sufficiently close to 1 and $B - \Gamma$ has sufficiently small (positive or negative) coefficients.

Step 3. Let P be the unique integral divisor so that

$$\Lambda := \Gamma + n\Delta - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor + P$$

is a boundary, (X, Λ) is plt, and $\lfloor \Lambda \rfloor = S$ (in particular, we are assuming $\Lambda \geq 0$). More precisely, we let $\mu_S P = 0$ and for each prime divisor $D \neq S$, we let

$$\mu_D P = -\mu_D \lfloor \Gamma + n\Delta - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor \rfloor$$

which satisfies

$$\mu_D P = -\mu_D \lfloor \Gamma - \Delta + \langle (n+1)\Delta \rangle \rfloor$$

where $\langle (n+1)\Delta \rangle$ is the fractional part of $(n+1)\Delta$. This implies $0 \leq \mu_D P \leq 1$ for any prime divisor D: indeed we can assume $D \neq S$; if D is a component of T, then D is not a component of Δ but $\mu_D \Gamma \in (0,1)$, hence $\mu_D P = 0$; if D is not a component of T, then $\mu_D(\Gamma - \Delta) = \mu_D(\Gamma - B)$ is sufficiently small, hence $0 \leq \mu_D P \leq 1$.

We show P is exceptional$/X'$. Assume D is a component of P which is not exceptional$/X'$. Then $D \neq S$, and since nB' is integral, $\mu_D n\Delta$ is integral, hence $\mu_D \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor = \mu_D n\Delta$ which implies $\mu_D P = -\mu_D \lfloor \Gamma \rfloor = 0$, a contradiction.

Step 4. Let

$$A' = -(K_{X'} + \Gamma' + \alpha M')$$

and let $A = \phi^* A'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} L + P &= n\Delta - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor + nN + P \\ &= K_X + \Gamma + \alpha M + A + n\Delta - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor + nN + P \\ &= K_X + \Lambda + A + \alpha M + nN \end{aligned}$$

Since $A + \alpha M + nN$ is nef and big, $h^1(L + P - S) = 0$ by the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem, hence

$$H^0(L + P) \to H^0((L + P)|_S)$$

is surjective.

Step 5. Let $R_{S'} := B^+_{S'} - B_{S'}$ which satisfies

$$-n(K_{S'} + B_{S'} + M_{S'}) \sim nR_{S'} \geq 0.$$

Letting R_S be the pullback of $R_{S'}$ we get

$$nN_S := nN|_S = -n(K_S + B_S + M_S) = -n\psi^*(K_{S'} + B_{S'} + M_{S'}) \sim nR_S \geq 0.$$

By construction,

$$\begin{aligned} (L + P)|_S &= (n\Delta - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor + nN + P)|_S \\ &\sim G_S := nR_S + n\Delta_S - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta_S \rfloor + P_S \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_S = \Delta|_S$ and $P_S = P|_S$.

We show $G_S \geq 0$. Assume C is a component of G_S with negative coefficient. Then there is a component D of $n\Delta - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor$ with negative coefficient such that C is a component of $D|_S$. But

$$\mu_C(n\Delta_S - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta_S \rfloor) = \mu_C(-\Delta_S + \langle (n+1)\Delta_S \rangle) \geq -\mu_C \Delta_S = -\mu_D \Delta > -1$$

which gives $\mu_C G_S > -1$ and this in turn implies $\mu_C G_S \geq 0$ because G_S is integral, a contradiction. Therefore $G_S \geq 0$, and by Step 4, $L + P \sim G$ for some effective divisor G whose support does not contain S and $G|_S = G_S$.

Step 6. By the previous step,

$$-nK_{X'} - nT' - \lfloor (n+1)\Delta' \rfloor - nM' = L' = L' + P' \sim G' \geq 0$$

where L' is the pushdown of L, etc. Since nB' is integral, $\lfloor (n+1)\Delta' \rfloor = n\Delta'$, so

$$nN' = -n(K_{X'} + B' + M') = -nK_{X'} - nT' - n\Delta' - nM' = L' \sim nR' := G' \geq 0.$$

Let $B'^+ = B' + R'$. Then $n(K_{X'} + B'^+ + M') \sim 0$.

By 6.1 (1), it remains to show $(X', B'^+ + M')$ is generalised lc. First we show

$$K_{S'} + B^+_{S'} + M_{S'} = (K_{X'} + B'^+ + M')|_{S'}$$

which is equivalent to showing $R'|_{S'} = R_{S'}$. Since

$$nR := G - P + \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor - n\Delta \sim L + \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor - n\Delta = nN \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/X'$$

and since $\lfloor (n+1)\Delta' \rfloor - n\Delta' = 0$ as $n\Delta'$ is integral, we get $\phi_* nR = G' = nR'$ and that R is the pullback of R'. Now

$$\begin{aligned} nR_S &= G_S - P_S + \lfloor (n+1)\Delta_S \rfloor - n\Delta_S \\ &= (G - P + \lfloor (n+1)\Delta \rfloor - n\Delta)|_S = nR|_S \end{aligned}$$

which means $R_S = R|_S$, hence $R_{S'} = R'|_{S'}$.

By generalised inversion of adjunction (3.2), $(X', B'^{+} + M')$ is generalised lc near S'. Let

$$\Omega' := aB'^{+} + (1-a)\Gamma' \text{ and } F = (a + (1-a)\alpha)M$$

for some $a \in (0,1)$ close to 1. If $(X', B'^{+} + M')$ is not generalised lc away from S', then $(X', \Omega' + F')$ is also not generalised lc away from S'. But then $K_{X'} + \Omega' + F'$ is anti-ample and its generalised non-klt locus has at least two disjoint components one of which is S'. This contradicts the connectedness principle (2.7). Thus $(X', B'^{+} + M')$ is generalised lc. □

Proposition 6.8. *Assume Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension $\leq d-1$ and Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d. Then Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension d for those $(X', B' + M')$ such that*

- $B' \in \mathfrak{R}$,
- *$(X', B' + M')$ is not generalised klt, and*
- *either $K_{X'} + B' + M' \not\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ or $M' \not\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$.*

Proof. Step 1. Taking a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised dlt model of $(X', B' + M')$ we can assume X' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial and that (X', B') is not klt. Let $X' \to Z'$ be the contraction defined by $-(K_{X'} + B' + M')$. Running an MMP on M' over Z' and replacing X' with the resulting model we can assume M' is nef/Z'. Note that since the MMP is an MMP on $-(K_{X'} + B')$, the non-klt property of (X', B') is preserved. Let $X' \to V'/Z'$ be the contraction defined by M'. If $\dim Z' > 0$, then $\dim V' > 0$. If $\dim Z' = 0$, then again $\dim V' > 0$ since in this case $M' \not\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. In particular, if M' is not big over Z', then we can apply Proposition 6.5.

From now on we can assume M' is nef and big over Z'. Then

$$-(K_{X'} + B' + \alpha M') = -(K_{X'} + B' + M') + (1-\alpha)M'$$

is globally nef and big for some rational number $\alpha < 1$ close to 1 which will be fixed throughout the proof. The contraction defined by $-(K_{X'} + B' + \alpha M')$ is nothing but $X' \to V'$. After running an MMP on B' over V' we can assume B' is nef over V', hence

$$-(K_{X'} + \beta B' + \alpha M') = -(K_{X'} + B' + \alpha M') + (1-\beta)B'$$

is also globally nef and big for any rational number β satisfying $\alpha \ll \beta < 1$. Note that since the latter MMP is $K_{X'} + B'$-trivial, the non-klt property of (X', B') is again preserved.

Step 2. Since X' is Fano type and $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial, $(X', 0)$ is klt. Thus since $(X', B' + M')$ is generalised lc, $(X', \beta B' + \alpha M')$ is generalised klt. Let (X'', B'') be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt model of (X', B'), and let M'' be the pullback of M'. Writing the pullback of $K_{X'} + \beta B'$ as $K_{X''} + \tilde{B}''$, perhaps after increasing β, we can assume the coefficients of $B'' - \tilde{B}''$ are sufficiently small. Replacing X', B', M' with X'', B'', M'' and renaming $\tilde{B}''$ to $\tilde{B}'$, we have: $(X', \tilde{B}' + \alpha M')$ is generalised klt, $-(K_{X'} + \tilde{B}' + \alpha M')$ is nef and big, and the coefficients of $B' - \tilde{B}'$ are sufficiently small. Moreover, every generalised non-klt centre of $(X', B' + \alpha M')$ is a non-klt centre of (X', B'): if D is a prime divisor on birational models of X' such that $a(D, X', B' + \alpha M') = 0$, then $a(D, X', B') = 0$ because

$$a(D, X', B' + \alpha M') = \alpha a(D, X', B' + M') + (1-\alpha)a(D, X', B').$$

Step 3. Write

$$-(K_{X'} + B' + \alpha M') \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A' + G'$$

where $A', G' \geq 0$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors and A' is ample. First assume that $\operatorname{Supp} G'$ does not contain any generalised non-klt centre of $(X', B' + \alpha M')$. Then, for some small $\delta > 0$,

$$-(K_{X'} + B' + \alpha M' + \delta G') \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (1-\delta)(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta}A' + A' + G')$$

is ample and $(X', B' + \delta G' + \alpha M')$ is generalised lc whose generalised non-klt locus is equal to the generalised non-klt locus of $(X', B' + \alpha M')$ which is in turn equal to the non-klt locus of (X', B'). Pick a component S' of $\lfloor B' \rfloor$ and let $\Gamma' = S' + a(B' - S' + \delta G')$ for some $a < 1$ close to 1. Then $(X', \Gamma' + \alpha M')$ is generalised plt, $\lfloor \Gamma' \rfloor = S'$, and $-(K_{X'} + \Gamma' + \alpha M')$ is ample. Now apply Proposition 6.7.

Step 4. From now on we assume that $\operatorname{Supp} G'$ contains some generalised non-klt centre of $(X', B' + \alpha M')$. Let t be the generalised lc threshold of $G' + B' - \tilde{B}'$ with respect to $(X', \tilde{B}' + \alpha M')$ and let $\Omega' := \tilde{B}' + t(G' + B' - \tilde{B}')$. As $(X', \tilde{B}' + \alpha M')$ is generalised klt, $t > 0$. We can assume the given morphism $\phi \colon X \to X'$ is a log resolution of $(X', B' + G')$. Write

$$K_X + B_\alpha + \alpha M = \phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + \alpha M')$$

and

$$K_X + \tilde{B}_\alpha + \alpha M = \phi^*(K_{X'} + \tilde{B}' + \alpha M')$$

from which we get $B_\alpha - \tilde{B}_\alpha = \phi^*(B' - \tilde{B}')$. Perhaps after replacing $\tilde{B}'$ with $b\tilde{B}' + (1-b)B'$ for some small $b > 0$, we can assume the coefficients of $B_\alpha - \tilde{B}_\alpha$ are sufficiently small.

Let $G = \phi^* G'$. Since $\operatorname{Supp} G'$ contains some generalised non-klt centre of $(X', B' + \alpha M')$, we can assume G and $\lfloor B_\alpha \rfloor^{\geq 0}$ have a common component, say T. Now

$$K_X + \tilde{B}_\alpha + t(B_\alpha - \tilde{B}_\alpha + G) + \alpha M = \phi^*(K_{X'} + \Omega' + \alpha M').$$

Since $\mu_T \tilde{B}_\alpha$ is sufficiently close to $\mu_T B_\alpha = 1$, we deduce t is sufficiently small. Moreover, letting $\Omega = \tilde{B}_\alpha + t(B_\alpha - \tilde{B}_\alpha + G)$ we have

$$\Omega \leq B_\alpha + tG \text{ and } \lfloor \Omega \rfloor^{\geq 0} \subseteq \lfloor B_\alpha + tG \rfloor^{\geq 0} = \lfloor B_\alpha \rfloor^{\geq 0}.$$

We will use these observations in Step 6.

Step 5. We show that $-(K_{X'} + \Omega' + \alpha M')$ is ample. By construction

$$-(K_{X'} + \tilde{B}' + \alpha M') = -(K_{X'} + B' + \alpha M') + B' - \tilde{B}' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A' + G' + B' - \tilde{B}'.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} -(K_{X'} + \Omega' + \alpha M') &= -(K_{X'} + \tilde{B}' + t(G' + B' - \tilde{B}') + \alpha M') \\ &= -(K_{X'} + \tilde{B}' + \alpha M') - t(G' + B' - \tilde{B}') \\ &\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A' + G' + B' - \tilde{B}' - t(G' + B' - \tilde{B}') \\ &= (1-t)(\frac{t}{1-t}A' + A' + G' + B' - \tilde{B}') \end{aligned}$$

which is ample.

Step 6. Assume $\lfloor \Omega' \rfloor \neq 0$ and pick a component S' of $\lfloor \Omega' \rfloor$. By Step 4, S' is a component of $\lfloor B' \rfloor$. We then define Γ' similar to Step 3 by perturbing the coefficients of Ω', say by letting $\Gamma' = S' + a(\Omega' - S')$ for some $a < 1$ close to 1, so that $\lfloor \Gamma' \rfloor = S'$, $(X', \Gamma' + \alpha M')$ is generalised plt, and $-(K_{X'} + \Gamma' + \alpha M')$ is ample. Then we apply Proposition 6.7.

Now assume $\lfloor \Omega' \rfloor = 0$. Let Ω° be the sum of the birational transform of Ω' and the reduced exceptional divisor of $X \to X'$. So $\Omega^\circ - \Omega$ is effective and exceptional$/X'$. Running

an MMP$/X'$ on $K_X+\Omega^\circ+\alpha M$ contracts all the components of $\Omega^\circ-\Omega$ as $K_X+\Omega^\circ+\alpha M\equiv \Omega^\circ-\Omega/X'$, hence we reach a model X''/X' such that if Ω'' and M'' are the pushdowns of Ω° and M, then $(X'',\Omega''+\alpha M'')$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised dlt model of $(X',\Omega'+\alpha M')$. The exceptional prime divisors of $X''\to X'$ all have coefficient 1 in Ω''. Moreover, any prime exceptional divisor D of $X\to X'$ not contracted over X'' is a component of $\lfloor\Omega\rfloor^{\geq 0}$, hence a component of $\lfloor B_\alpha\rfloor^{\geq 0}$, by Step 4. Thus if B'' is the pushdown of B_α, then $K_{X''}+B''+\alpha M''$ is the pullback of $K_{X'}+B'+\alpha M'$ to X'', and B'' is the sum of the birational transform of B' and the reduced exceptional divisor of $X''\to X'$. Since $(X',B'+M')$ is generalised lc, M'' is the pullback of M' and $K_{X''}+B''+M''$ is the pullback of $K_{X'}+B'+M'$.

Let $\tilde\Delta''$ be the sum of the birational transform of $\tilde B'$ and the reduced exceptional divisor of $X''\to X'$. Note that $\tilde\Delta''\leq\Omega''$ and $(X'',\tilde\Delta''+\alpha M'')$ is generalised dlt. Run an MMP$/X'$ on $K_{X''}+\tilde\Delta''+\alpha M''$. The MMP ends with X' because $(X',\tilde B'+\alpha M')$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised klt. The last step of the MMP is a divisorial contraction which contracts a component S'' of $\lfloor\Omega''\rfloor$. Abuse notation and replace $X''\to X'$ with that last contraction. By construction, $(X'',\tilde\Delta''+\alpha M'')$ is generalised plt and $-(K_{X''}+\tilde\Delta''+\alpha M'')$ is ample over X'. Defining

$$\Gamma''=a\tilde\Delta''+(1-a)\Omega''$$

for a sufficiently small $a>0$ we can check that $(X'',\Gamma''+\alpha M'')$ is generalised plt, $S''=\lfloor\Gamma''\rfloor$, and $-(K_{X''}+\Gamma''+\alpha M'')$ is globally ample because

$$-(K_{X''}+\Gamma''+\alpha M'')=-a(K_{X''}+\tilde\Delta''+\alpha M'')-(1-a)(K_{X''}+\Omega''+\alpha M'')$$

and because $-(K_{X''}+\Omega''+\alpha M'')$ is the pullback of the ample divisor $-(K_{X'}+\Omega'+\alpha M')$. Now apply Proposition 6.7 to $K_{X''}+B''+M''$.

□

Lemma 6.9. *Assume Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension $\leq d-1$ and Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d. Then Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension d for those $(X',B'+M')$ such that*

- *$B'\in\mathfrak{R}$, and*
- *$(X',B'+M')$ is strongly non-exceptional.*

Proof. By assumption there is $P'\geq 0$ such that $K_{X'}+B'+M'+P'\sim_{\mathbb{R}}0$ and $(X',B'+P'+M')$ is not generalised lc. In particular, $P'\neq 0$. Modifying P' we can replace $\sim_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Let t be the generalised lc threshold of P' with respect to $(X',B'+M')$. Then $t<1$. Let $\Omega'=B'+tP'$ and let $(X'',\Omega''+M'')$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised dlt model of $(X',\Omega'+M')$. Let $\Theta''=\Omega''-tP'^{\sim}$ where $P'^{\sim}$ is the birational transform of P'. Let π denote $X''\to X'$ and let P'' be the pullback of P'. Then $\Theta''\in\mathfrak{R}$, X'' is Fano type, and

$$-(K_{X''}+\Theta''+M'')=-(K_{X''}+\Omega''-tP'^{\sim}+M'')$$
$$=tP'^{\sim}-\pi^*(K_{X'}+\Omega'+M')=tP'^{\sim}-tP''-\pi^*(K_{X'}+B'+M')$$
$$\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}tP'^{\sim}+(1-t)P''.$$

Run an MMP on $-(K_{X''}+\Theta''+M'')$ and let X''' be the resulting model. Since $P''\geq 0$ is nef and non-zero, its pushdown $P'''\neq 0$, hence $-(K_{X'''}+\Theta'''+M''')$ is nef but $\not\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$. Moreover, since P'' is semi-ample, there is $Q''\geq 0$ such that $K_{X''}+\Omega''+Q''+M''\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$ and $(X'',\Omega''+Q''+M'')$ is generalised lc. Therefore, $(X''',\Theta'''+M''')$ is generalised lc but not generalised klt.

By 6.1 (3), if $K_{X'''}+\Theta'''+M'''$ has an n-complement $K_{X'''}+\Theta'''^{+}+M'''$ with $\Theta'''^{+}\geq\Theta'''$, then $K_{X''}+\Theta''+M''$ has an n-complement $K_{X''}+\Theta''^{+}+M''$ with $\Theta''^{+}\geq\Theta''$ which in turn gives an n-complement $K_{X'}+B'^{+}+M'$ of $K_{X'}+B'+M'$ with $B'^{+}\geq B'$. Now apply Proposition 6.8 to $K_{X'''}+\Theta'''+M'''$.

□

Lemma 6.10. *Assume Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension $\leq d-1$ and Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d. Then Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension d for those $(X', B'+M')$ such that*

- *$B' \in \mathfrak{R}$, and*
- *$(X', B'+M')$ is non-exceptional.*

Proof. By assumption there is $P' \geq 0$ such that $K_{X'}+B'+M'+P' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$ and $(X', B'+P'+M')$ is not generalised klt. Modifying P' we can replace $\sim_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}$. We can assume $(X', B'+P'+M')$ is generalised lc otherwise $(X', B'+M')$ is strongly non-exceptional, so we can apply Lemma 6.9. Applying the construction in the proof of Lemma 6.9, by taking $t=1$, and replacing $(X', B'+M')$ with $(X''', \Theta'''+M''')$, we can assume $(X', B'+M')$ is not generalised klt and that X' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Applying Proposition 6.8, we can further assume $M' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and that $K_{X'}+B'+M' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. In particular, $K_{X'}+B' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, $M=\phi^*M' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, and (X', B') is not klt.

Since X' is Fano type, $\mathrm{Pic}(X')$ and $\mathrm{Pic}(X)$ are torsion-free (cf. [18, Proposition 2.1.2]). Therefore, if r is the Cartier index of $K_{X'}+B'+M'$, then $r(K_{X'}+B'+M') \sim 0$, hence $K_{X'}+B'+M'$ is an rp-complement of itself. Thus it is enough to show r is bounded. Moreover, $pM \sim 0$, so $pM' \sim 0$, hence we only need to show the Cartier index of $K_{X'}+B'$ is bounded.

By Lemma 2.32, there is $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ depending only on $d, \mathfrak{R}$ such that if D is any prime divisor on birational models of X' with $a(D, X', 0) < \epsilon$, then $a(D, X', B') = 0$. Let $X'' \to X'$ be the birational contraction which extracts exactly those D with $a(D, X', 0) < \epsilon$. Then X'' is Fano type and ϵ-lc. Moreover, if $K_{X''}+B''$ is the pullback of $K_{X'}+B'$, then all the exceptional divisors of $X'' \to X'$ appear in B'' with coefficient 1. Replacing (X', B') with (X'', B'') we can assume X' is ϵ-lc. After running an MMP on $K_{X'}$ we can assume we have a Mori fibre structure $X' \to T'$. Applying Proposition 6.5, we can assume $\dim T' = 0$, so X' is an ϵ-lc Fano.

By Lemma 6.9, there is a number n depending only on d such that if Y' is any strongly non-exceptional Fano variety of dimension d with klt singularities, then $K_{Y'}$ has an n-complement. We can assume $pI(\mathfrak{R})|n$. On the other hand, by Proposition 4.5, there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on $d, \epsilon, \mathfrak{R}$ such that $|-mK_{X'}|$ defines a birational map. Replacing n once more we can assume $m|n$. So $|-nK_{X'}|$ also defines a birational map. Replacing $\phi\colon X \to X'$ we can assume $\phi^*(-nK_{X'})$ is linearly equivalent to the sum of a general base point free divisor A and fixed part R. Then $n(K_{X'}+\frac{1}{n}R'+\frac{1}{n}A') \sim 0$. We claim $(X', \frac{1}{n}R'+\frac{1}{n}A')$ is lc. If not, then $(X', 0)$ is strongly exceptional, hence by our choice of n we have an n-complement $K_{X'}+C'^{+}$ of $K_{X'}$. Since $nC'^{+} \in |-nK_{X'}|$ and (X', C'^{+}) is lc, we deduce $(X', \frac{1}{n}R'+\frac{1}{n}A')$ is also lc because $A'+R' \in |-nK_{X'}|$ is a general member. This is a contradiction.

Now let $\Delta' = \frac{1}{2}B' + \frac{1}{2n}R'$ and $N' = \frac{1}{2n}A'$. Since

$$2n(K_{X'}+\Delta'+N') \sim n(K_{X'}+B')$$

it is enough to show the Cartier index of $K_{X'}+\Delta'+N'$ is bounded. Assume $(X', \Delta'+N')$ is klt. Let $\epsilon' = \min\{\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{1}{2n}\}$. We claim $(X', \Delta'+N')$ is ϵ'-lc. If not, then there is some prime divisor D with $0 < a(D, X', \Delta'+N') < \epsilon'$. Then either $0 < a(D, X', B')$ which implies $\epsilon \leq a(D, X', B')$ by Lemma 2.32, or $0 < a(D, X', \frac{1}{n}R'+\frac{1}{n}A')$ which implies $\frac{1}{n} \leq a(D, X', \frac{1}{n}R'+\frac{1}{n}A')$. In either case we get

$$\epsilon' \leq a(D, X', \Delta'+N') = \frac{1}{2}a(D, X', B') + \frac{1}{2}a(D, X', \frac{1}{n}R'+\frac{1}{n}A')$$

a contradiction. So $(X', \Delta' + N')$ is ϵ'-lc. Therefore, X' belongs to a bounded family by [14, Corollary 1.7] as the coefficients of $\Delta' + N'$ belong to a fixed finite set, hence the Cartier index of $K_{X'} + \Delta' + N'$ is bounded as required.

Now we can assume $(X', \Delta' + N')$ is not klt. Consider this pair as a generalised pair with data $X \to X'$ and $N = \frac{1}{2n}A$. It is not generalised klt and obviously $N' \not\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, hence by Proposition 6.8, $K_{X'} + \Delta' + N'$ is an l-complement of itself for some bounded l which implies the Cartier index of $K_{X'} + \Delta' + N'$ is at most l.

□

6.11. **Boundedness of complements.**

Construction 6.12 Let $(X', B' + M')$ be as in Theorem 1.9 and assume X' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Since X' is Fano type, $-K_{X'}$ is big, hence running an MMP on $-K_{X'}$ ends with a model $\tilde{X}'$ such that $-K_{\tilde{X}'}$ is nef and big. Take a general $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $\tilde{C}' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{\tilde{X}'}$ with coefficient $\leq 1-\epsilon$. Let $K_{X'} + C'$ be the crepant pullback of $K_{\tilde{X}'} + \tilde{C}'$. Since $X' \dashrightarrow \tilde{X}'$ is also the process of an MMP on C' and since $\tilde{C}' \geq 0$, we get $C' \geq 0$.

Let D be a prime divisor on birational models of X' such that $a(D, X', C') < \epsilon$. We claim $a(D, X', B' + M') < \epsilon$. Indeed if $P' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is general, then

$$a(D, X', B' + M') = a(D, X', B' + P' + M') = a(D, \tilde{X}', \tilde{B}' + \tilde{P}' + \tilde{M}')$$
$$\leq a(D, \tilde{X}', 0) = a(D, \tilde{X}', \tilde{C}') = a(D, X', C') < \epsilon.$$

Let $X'' \to X'$ be the extraction of all the prime divisors D such that $a(D, X', C') < \epsilon$. Let $K_{X''} + B'' + M''$ be the pullback of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$. Then any component of B'' which is exceptional/X' has coefficient $> 1 - \epsilon$. Also note that if $K_{X''} + C''$ is the pullback of $K_{X'} + C'$, then (X'', C'') is ϵ-lc in codimension at least two, i.e. any D with $a(D, X'', C'') < \epsilon$ is already a divisor on X''.

Now assume ϵ is sufficiently small, depending only on $d, p, \mathfrak{R}$. Let Θ'' be the boundary whose coefficients are the same as B'' except that we replace each coefficient in $(1 - \epsilon, 1)$ with 1 (similar to 2.33). That is, $\Theta'' = (B'')^{\leq 1-\epsilon} + \lceil (B'')^{>1-\epsilon} \rceil$. Run an MMP on $-(K_{X''} + \Theta'' + M'')$ and let X''' be the resulting model. Then we argue that

- $(X'', \Theta'' + M'')$ is generalised lc,
- the MMP does not contract any component of $\lfloor \Theta'' \rfloor$,
- $-(K_{X'''} + \Theta''' + M''')$ is nef,
- $(X''', \Theta''' + M''')$ is generalised lc, and
- X''' is ϵ-lc.

The first four claims follow from 2.33. We prove the last claim. Any component of C'' with coefficient in $(1 - \epsilon, 1)$ is a component of B'' with coefficient in $(1 - \epsilon, 1]$, hence a component of $\lfloor \Theta'' \rfloor$, so it is not contracted by the MMP. Thus (X''', C''') is ϵ-lc in codimension at least two, hence X''' is ϵ-lc. Note that if $(X''', \Theta''' + M''')$ is generalised klt, then $\lfloor \Theta''' \rfloor = 0$, so C''' has no component with coefficient in $(1 - \epsilon, 1)$ which implies (X''', C''') is ϵ-lc in any codimension.

Finally, since $B'' \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R}) \cup (1 - \epsilon, 1]$ and since 1 is the only accumulation point of $\Phi(\mathfrak{R})$, there is a finite set $\mathfrak{T} \subset [0, 1]$ of rational numbers which includes $\mathfrak{R}$ and which depends only on $\epsilon, \mathfrak{R}$ such that $\Theta'' \in \mathfrak{T}$ (note that by our choice of ϵ, $\mathfrak{I}$ depends only on $d, p, \mathfrak{R}$).

Proposition 6.13. *Assume Theorems 1.8 and 1.10 hold in dimension $\leq d$. Then Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension d.*

Proof. By induction on d we can assume Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension $\leq d - 1$. Let $(X', B' + M')$ be as in Theorem 1.9 in dimension d. Replacing $(X', B' + M')$ with a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised dlt model we can assume X' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Pick a sufficiently small

number $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ as in 6.12. We use the notation and constructions of 6.12. If $K_{X'''} + \Theta''' + M'''$ has an n-complement $K_{X'''} + \Theta'''^+ + M'''$ with $\Theta'''^+ \geq \Theta'''$, then we get an n-complement $K_{X''} + \Theta''^+ + M''$ of $K_{X''} + \Theta'' + M''$ with $\Theta''^+ \geq \Theta''$ which in turn gives an n-complement $K_{X'} + \Theta'^+ + M'$ of $K_{X'} + \Theta' + M'$ with $\Theta'^+ \geq \Theta'$ where Θ' is the pushdown of Θ''. Since $\Theta' \geq B'$, $K_{X'} + \Theta'^+ + M'$ is an n-complement of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$. Therefore, replacing X' with X''', B' with Θ''', M' with M''', and $\mathfrak{R}$ with $\mathfrak{T}$, we can assume $B' \in \mathfrak{R}$ (where $\mathfrak{T}$ is as in the end of 6.12).

By Lemma 6.10, we can assume $(X', B' + M')$ is exceptional. Since we are assuming Theorem 1.10 in dimension d, X' is bounded. So there is a bounded number n divisible by $pI(\mathfrak{R})$ such that $-n(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is nef and Cartier. Since X' is Fano type, we can use the effective base point free theorem [27], so we can assume $-n(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is base point free. Now let

$$G' \in |-n(K_{X'} + B' + M')|$$

be a general member and let $B'^+ = B' + \frac{1}{n}G'$. Then $K_{X'} + B'^+ + M'$ is an n-complement of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$.

□

7. **Boundedness of exceptional pairs**

The aim of this section is to treat Theorems 1.3 and 1.10 inductively.

7.1. **A directed MMP.** Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a projective generalised lc pair with data $X \xrightarrow{\phi} X'$ and M. Assume X' is Fano type and $-(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is nef. Let $D' \geq 0$ be an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor on X' and N a nef $\mathbb{R}$-divisor on X such that $D' + N'$ is $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier and not numerically trivial. We run an MMP as follows. Let t be the largest number such that

$$-(K_{X'} + B' + tD' + tN' + M')$$

is nef and

$$(X', B' + tD' + tN' + M')$$

is generalised lc. Then either t is the generalised lc threshold of $D' + N'$ with respect to $(X', B' + M')$ or there is an extremal ray R such that

$$(K_{X'} + B' + tD' + tN' + M') \cdot R = 0 \text{ and } (D' + N') \cdot R > 0.$$

In the former case we stop. In the latter case, if R defines a Mori fibre structure, we again stop. Otherwise we perform the flip or divisorial contraction associated to R and continue the process. That is, in each step we try to increase t keeping the mentioned nefness and generalised lc properties and we continue until we hit either a generalised lc threshold or a Mori fibre structure. Note that in each step we have $(K_{X'} + B' + M') \cdot R \leq 0$. The process gives an MMP which we refer to as *running an MMP for* $K_{X'} + B' + M'$ *by adding multiples of* $D' + N'$. It terminates with some model X''. Let $\tilde{t}$ be the maximum of the t appearing in the process.

We can see from the definition that the intersection of

$$K_{X'} + B' + \tilde{t}D' + \tilde{t}N' + M'$$

with each extremal ray in the process is nonnegative. Therefore, replacing ϕ we can assume the induced map $\psi \colon X \dashrightarrow X''$ is a morphism, and that

$$\psi^*(K_{X''} + B'' + \tilde{t}D'' + \tilde{t}N'' + M'') \geq \phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + \tilde{t}D' + \tilde{t}N' + M').$$

7.2. **Bounds on singularities.**

Lemma 7.3. *Let $d, p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Phi \subset [0,1]$ be a DCC set. Then there is a number $\epsilon > 0$ depending only on d, p, Φ satisfying the following. Let $(X', B' + M')$ be a projective generalised pair with data $\phi\colon X \to X'$ and M such that*

- *$(X', B' + M')$ is exceptional of dimension d,*
- *$B' \in \Phi$ and pM is Cartier, and*
- *X' is Fano type.*

Then for any $0 \leq P' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} -(K_{X'} + B' + M')$, the pair $(X', B' + P' + M')$ is generalised ϵ-lc.

Proof. Let $(X', B' + M')$ and P' be as in the statement. Since $(X', B' + M')$ is exceptional, $(X', B' + P' + M')$ is klt. Taking a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorialisation we can assume X' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Let D'' be a prime divisor on birational models of X such that $a := a(D'', X', B' + P' + M')$ is minimal. We can assume $a < 1$. Let $X'' \to X'$ be the birational contraction which extracts exactly D''; it is the identity morphism if D'' is already a divisor on X'. Let $K_{X''} + B'' + M''$ be the pullback of $K_{X'} + B' + M'$, and let P'' be the pullback of P'. Let e and c be the coefficients of D'' in B'' and P'' respectively (note that it is possible to have $e < 0$). By assumption, $e + c = 1 - a$.

By 2.6 (6), X'' is Fano type. Running an MMP on

$$-(K_{X''} + B'' + cD'' + M'') \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} P'' - cD'' \geq 0$$

we get a model X''' on which $-(K_{X'''} + B''' + cD''' + M''')$ is nef. We can assume the induced maps $\psi\colon X \dashrightarrow X''$ and $\pi\colon X \dashrightarrow X'''$ are morphisms. Then

$$\pi^*(K_{X'''} + B''' + cD''' + M''') \geq \psi^*(K_{X''} + B'' + cD'' + M'').$$

Next run an MMP for $K_{X'''} + B''' + cD''' + M'''$ by adding multiples of D''', as in 7.1. Let $\overline{X}$ be the resulting model on which $-(K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{B} + \tilde{c}\overline{D} + \overline{M})$ is nef for some $\tilde{c} \geq c$. We can assume the induced map $\rho\colon X \dashrightarrow \overline{X}$ is a morphism. By construction,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^*(K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{B} + \tilde{c}\overline{D} + \overline{M}) &\geq \pi^*(K_{X'''} + B''' + \tilde{c}D''' + M''') \\ &\geq \psi^*(K_{X''} + B'' + cD'' + M'') \geq \phi^*(K_{X'} + B' + M').\end{aligned}$$

This implies $(\overline{X}, \overline{B} + \tilde{c}\overline{D} + \overline{M})$ is klt as $(X', B' + M')$ is exceptional. So by definition of the MMP in 7.1, there is a Mori fibre structure $\overline{X} \to \overline{T}$ so that

$$-(K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{B} + \tilde{c}\overline{D} + \overline{M}) \equiv 0/\overline{T}$$

and $\overline{D}$ is ample over $\overline{T}$. By construction, the coefficients of $\overline{B} - e\overline{D}$ belong to Φ. Now restricting $K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{B} + \tilde{c}\overline{D} + \overline{M}$ to the general fibres of $\overline{X} \to \overline{T}$ and applying [7, Theorem 1.5] shows that $e + \tilde{c}$ is bounded away from 1. This implies $e + c$ is also bounded away from 1. That is, there is $\epsilon > 0$ depending only on d, p, Φ such that $e + c \leq 1 - \epsilon$. So $\epsilon \leq a$, hence $(X', B' + P' + M')$ is generalised ϵ-lc.

□

7.4. **From complements to Theorem 1.3.**

Lemma 7.5. *Assume Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension $\leq d - 1$ and Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d. Then Theorem 1.3 holds in dimension d.*

Proof. Assume the statement is not true. Then there is a sequence X_i of exceptional weak Fano varieties of dimension d such that no infinite subsequence forms a bounded family. Replacing X_i we can assume they are Fano varieties. Let ϵ_i be the minimal log discrepancy of X_i. Let $\epsilon = \limsup \epsilon_i$.

First assume $\epsilon < 1$. Replacing the sequence we can assume $\epsilon_i \leq \epsilon$ for every i. There is a birational contraction $X_i'' \to X_i$ from a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial variety which contracts only one prime divisor D_i'', and $a(D_i'', X_i, 0) = \epsilon_i$. Let $K_{X_i''} + e_i D_i''$ be the pullback of K_{X_i}. Then $e_i \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Run an MMP, as in 7.1, for $K_{X_i''} + e_i D_i''$ by adding multiples of D_i'', and let $(X_i''', \tilde{e}_i D_i''')$ be the resulting pair. Take common resolutions $\psi_i \colon W_i \to X_i''$ and $\pi_i \colon W_i \to X_i'''$. Then

$$\pi_i^*(K_{X_i'''} + \tilde{e}_i D_i''') \geq \psi_i^*(K_{X_i''} + \tilde{e}_i D_i'') \geq \psi_i^*(K_{X_i''} + e_i D_i'').$$

This implies $(X_i''', \tilde{e}_i D_i''')$ is exceptional as $(X_i'', e_i D_i'')$ is exceptional. In particular, we do not get a lc threshold in the process, hence there is a Mori fibre structure $X_i''' \to T_i'''$ such that $-(K_{X_i'''} + \tilde{e}_i D_i''')$ is nef and numerically trivial over T_i'''.

Pick $0 \leq P_i''' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -(K_{X_i'''} + \tilde{e}_i D_i''')$ and let the crepant pullback of $K_{X_i'''} + \tilde{e}_i D_i''' + P_i'''$ to X_i be $K_{X_i} + P_i$. Then $P_i \geq 0$, and applying Lemma 7.3, (X_i, P_i) is $\tilde{\epsilon}$-lc for some $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$ independent of i. Thus $(X_i''', \tilde{e}_i D_i''')$ is also $\tilde{\epsilon}$-lc. Applying Theorem 1.4 to the restriction of $K_{X_i'''} + \tilde{e}_i D_i'''$ to the general fibres of $X_i''' \to T_i'''$ shows that these fibres are bounded. Moreover, by Lemma 2.11, $\tilde{e}_i$ belongs to a finite set independent of i. Now using Proposition 6.5 if $\dim T_i''' > 0$, or using Theorem 1.4 if $\dim T_i''' = 0$, we deduce that $K_{X_i'''} + \tilde{e}_i D_i'''$ has an n-complement $K_{X_i'''} + B_i'''$ for some n independent of i such that $\tilde{e}_i D_i''' \leq B_i'''$. Therefore, K_{X_i} has an n-complement $K_{X_i} + B_i$, by 6.1 (2). Since X_i is exceptional, (X_i, B_i) is klt. So the X_i form a bounded family by Theorem 1.4, a contradiction.

Now we can assume $\epsilon = 1$ and that the ϵ_i form an increasing sequence approaching 1. By Proposition 4.7, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|-mK_{X_i}|$ defines a birational map for every i. Pick $0 \leq C_i \sim -m_i K_{X_i}$. Since X_i is exceptional, $(X_i, B_i := \frac{1}{m} C_i)$ is klt, hence it is $\frac{1}{m}$-lc. Therefore, X_i are bounded by Theorem 1.4, a contradiction.

□

7.6. **Bound on exceptional thresholds.**

Lemma 7.7. *Let $d, p \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\Phi \subset [0,1]$ be a DCC set. Then there is $\beta \in (0,1)$ depending only on d, p, Φ satisfying the following. Assume $(X', B' + M')$ is a projective generalised pair with data $\phi \colon X \to X'$ and M such that*

- *$(X', B' + M')$ is exceptional of dimension d,*
- *$B' \in \Phi$, and pM is Cartier,*
- *$-(K_{X'} + B' + M')$ is nef, and*
- *X' is Fano type and $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial.*

Then $(X', B' + \alpha M')$ is exceptional for every $\alpha \in [\beta, 1]$.

Proof. Step 1. Suppose the lemma is not true. Then there exist a strictly increasing sequence of numbers α_i approaching 1 and a sequence $(X_i', B_i' + M_i')$ of generalised pairs as in the statement such that $(X_i', B_i' + \alpha_i M_i')$ is non-exceptional. In particular, M_i' is not numerically trivial. For each i there exists

$$0 \leq P_i' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} -(K_{X_i'} + B_i' + \alpha_i M_i') = -(K_{X_i'} + B_i' + M_i') + (1 - \alpha_i) M_i'$$

such that $(X_i', B_i' + P_i' + \alpha_i M_i')$ is not generalised klt. Run an MMP on P_i' and replace X_i' with the resulting model so that we can assume P_i' is nef. The MMP does not contract any divisor because $N_\sigma(P_i') = 0$, hence all our assumptions are preserved except $-(K_{X_i'} + B_i' + M_i')$ may not be nef any more (but we will not need it).

Step 2. Let t_i be the generalised lc threshold of P_i' with respect to $(X_i', B_i' + \alpha_i M_i')$. By Step 1, $t_i \leq 1$. Let $\Omega_i' = B_i' + t_i P_i'$ and let $(X_i'', \Omega_i'' + \alpha_i M_i'')$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial generalised

dlt model of $(X_i', \Omega_i' + \alpha_i M_i')$. Let Γ_i'' be the sum of the birational transform of B_i' and the reduced exceptional of $X_i'' \to X_i'$. Adding 1 to Φ, then $\Gamma_i'' \in \Phi$, $\Gamma_i'' \leq \Omega_i''$, and $\lfloor \Gamma_i'' \rfloor \neq 0$. Let $G_i'' = \Omega_i'' - \Gamma_i''$. Then from

$$-(K_{X_i'} + \Omega_i' + \alpha_i M_i') \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (1-t_i)P_i'$$

we get

$$-(K_{X_i''} + \Gamma_i'' + \alpha_i M_i'') = -(K_{X_i''} + \Omega_i'' + \alpha_i M_i'') + G_i'' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (1-t_i)P_i'' + G_i'' \geq 0$$

where P_i'' is the pullback of P_i'.

Step 3. By 2.6 (6), X_i'' is Fano type. Run an MMP on $-(K_{X_i''} + \Gamma_i'' + \alpha_i M_i'')$ and let X_i''' be the resulting model. Since $(X_i'', \Omega_i'' + \alpha_i M_i'')$ is generalised lc and P_i'' is semi-ample, $(X_i''', \Omega_i''' + \alpha_i M_i''')$ is generalised lc which implies $(X_i''', \Gamma_i''' + \alpha_i M_i''')$ is generalised lc too as $\Gamma_i''' \leq \Omega_i'''$. Moreover, the MMP produces a minimal model, that is, $-(K_{X_i'''} + \Gamma_i''' + \alpha_i M_i''')$ is nef. By construction, $(X_i''', \Gamma_i''' + \alpha_i M_i''')$ is not generalised klt, and assuming the induced maps $\psi_i \colon X_i \dashrightarrow X_i''$ and $\pi_i \colon X_i \dashrightarrow X_i'''$ are morphisms, we have

$$\pi_i^*(K_{X_i'''} + \Gamma_i''' + \alpha_i M_i''') \geq \psi_i^*(K_{X_i''} + \Gamma_i'' + \alpha_i M_i'').$$

Step 4. Now run a partial MMP for $K_{X_i'''} + \Gamma_i''' + \alpha_i M_i'''$, as in 7.1, by adding multiples of M_i''', that is, by increasing α_i but not exceeding 1. Denote the resulting model by $\overline{X}_i$, and assume the process increases α_i to $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ (so by assumption, $\tilde{\alpha}_i \leq 1$). If $\tilde{\alpha}_i = 1$ for every i, then go to Step 5. Otherwise we can assume $\tilde{\alpha}_i < 1$ for every i. By definition of the MMP, either $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ is the generalised lc threshold of $\overline{M}_i$ with respect to $(\overline{X}_i, \overline{\Gamma}_i)$, or there is an extremal ray R_i defining a Mori fibre structure $\overline{X}_i \to \overline{T}_i$ such that

$$-(K_{\overline{X}_i} + \overline{\Gamma}_i + \tilde{\alpha}_i \overline{M}_i) \cdot R_i = 0$$

and $\overline{M}_i \cdot R_i > 0$. Since $\lim \tilde{\alpha}_i = 1$, we can assume the former case holds for every i, by [7, Theorem 1.4], which leads to a contradiction by [7, Theorem 1.5] applied to the restriction of $K_{\overline{X}_i} + \overline{\Gamma}_i + \tilde{\alpha}_i \overline{M}_i$ to the general fibres of $\overline{X}_i \to \overline{T}_i$.

Step 5. Now we assume $\tilde{\alpha}_i = 1$ for every i which in particular means $-(K_{\overline{X}_i} + \overline{\Gamma}_i + \overline{M}_i)$ is nef. Assuming the induced map $\rho_i \colon X_i \dashrightarrow \overline{X}_i$ is a morphism, by 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_i^*(K_{\overline{X}_i} + \overline{\Gamma}_i + \overline{M}_i) &\geq \pi_i^*(K_{X_i'''} + \Gamma_i''' + M_i''') \\
&= \pi_i^*(K_{X_i'''} + \Gamma_i''' + \alpha_i M_i''') + \pi_i^*(1-\alpha_i)M_i''' \\
&\geq \psi_i^*(K_{X_i''} + \Gamma_i'' + \alpha_i M_i'') + \pi_i^*(1-\alpha_i)M_i'''
\end{aligned}$$

from which we get

$$\psi_{i*}\rho_i^*(K_{\overline{X}_i} + \overline{\Gamma}_i + \overline{M}_i) \geq K_{X_i''} + \Gamma_i'' + \alpha_i M_i'' + \psi_{i*}\pi_i^*(1-\alpha_i)M_i'''.$$

Now since M_i is nef we get

$$\psi_{i*}\pi_i^*(1-\alpha_i)M_i''' \geq \psi_{i*}(1-\alpha_i)M_i = (1-\alpha_i)M_i''$$

which in turn implies

$$\psi_{i*}\rho_i^*(K_{\overline{X}_i} + \overline{\Gamma}_i + \overline{M}_i) \geq K_{X_i''} + \Gamma_i'' + M_i''.$$

Step 6. Pick

$$0 \leq \overline{Q}_i \sim_{\mathbb{R}} -(K_{\overline{X}_i} + \overline{\Gamma}_i + \overline{M}_i).$$

By Step 5, we can write the crepant pullback of $K_{\overline{X}_i}+\overline{\Gamma}_i+\overline{Q}_i+\overline{M}_i$ to X_i'' as $K_{X_i''}+\Gamma_i''+Q_i''+M_i''$ for some $Q_i''\geq 0$. Therefore, $(X_i', B_i'+Q_i'+M_i')$ is not generalised klt and

$$K_{X_i'}+B_i'+Q_i'+M_i'\sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$$

where Q_i' is the pushdown of Q_i'. This is a contradiction as $(X_i', B_i'+M_i')$ is exceptional. □

7.8. **Bound on anti-canonical volumes.**

Lemma 7.9. *Let $d,p\in\mathbb{N}$ and let $\Phi\subset[0,1]$ be a DCC set. Then there is v depending only on d,p,Φ satisfying the following. Let $(X',B'+M')$ be a projective generalised pair with data $\phi\colon X\to X'$ and M such that*

- *$(X',B'+M')$ is generalised klt of dimension d,*
- *$B'\in\Phi$ and pM is Cartier and big,*
- *$K_{X'}+B'+M'\sim_{\mathbb{R}}0$, and*
- *X' is Fano type.*

Then $\mathrm{vol}(-K_{X'})\leq v$.

Proof. If the statement does not hold, then there is a sequence of generalised pairs $(X_i', B_i'+M_i')$ as in the statement such that the volumes $\mathrm{vol}(-K_{X_i'})$ form a strictly increasing sequence approaching ∞. After taking a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorialisation we can assume X_i' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Since pM_i is nef and big and Cartier, by Lemma 2.30, $K_{X_i}+3dpM_i$ is big, hence $K_{X_i'}+3dpM_i'$ is big too. Thus $\mathrm{vol}(-K_{X_i'})<\mathrm{vol}(3dpM_i')$, hence it is enough to show $\mathrm{vol}(M_i')$ is bounded from above. We can assume the volumes $\mathrm{vol}(M_i')$ form a strictly increasing sequence of numbers approaching ∞.

There is a strictly decreasing sequence of numbers δ_i approaching zero such that $\mathrm{vol}(\delta_iM_i')>d^d$. Thus letting $\alpha_i=1-\delta_i$,

$$\mathrm{vol}(-(K_{X_i'}+B_i'+\alpha_iM_i')))=\mathrm{vol}(\delta_iM_i')>d^d,$$

hence there is some

$$0\leq P_i'\sim_{\mathbb{R}}-(K_{X_i'}+B_i'+\alpha_iM_i')$$

such that $(X_i', B_i'+P_i'+\alpha_iM_i'))$ is not generalised klt. In particular, $(X_i', B_i'+\alpha_iM_i')$ is non-exceptional. This contradicts Lemma 7.7 as $\lim\alpha_i=1$ and $(X_i', B_i'+M_i')$ are exceptional. □

7.10. **Bound on lc thresholds.**

Lemma 7.11. *Let $d,p,l\in\mathbb{N}$ and let $\Phi\subset[0,1]$ be a DCC set. Then there is a positive real number t depending only on d,p,l,Φ satisfying the following. Let $(X',B'+M')$ be a projective generalised pair with data $\phi\colon X\to X'$ and M such that*

- *$(X',B'+M')$ is exceptional of dimension d,*
- *$B'\in\Phi$ and pM is Cartier and big,*
- *$-(K_{X'}+B'+M')$ is nef, and*
- *X' is Fano type and $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial.*

Then for any $L'\in|-lK_{X'}|$, the pair (X',tL') is klt.

Proof. If the statement does not hold, then there exist a decreasing sequence of numbers t_i approaching zero and a sequence $(X_i', B_i'+M_i')$ of generalised pairs as in the statement

such that $(X_i', t_i L_i')$ is not klt for some $L_i' \in |-lK_{X_i'}|$. Since M_i is nef and big and Cartier, by Lemma 2.30,

$$K_{X_i'} + 3dpM_i' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 3dpM_i' - \frac{1}{l}L_i'$$

is big.

By Lemma 7.7, there is a rational number $\beta \in (0,1)$ such that $(X_i', B_i' + \beta M_i')$ is exceptional for every i. Let s_i be the generalised lc threshold of L_i' with respect to $(X_i', B_i' + \beta M_i')$. Then $s_i \leq t_i$. We can assume $s_i < \frac{1-\beta}{3dpl}$ for every i. Thus

$$-(K_{X_i'} + B_i' + s_i L_i' + \beta M_i') = -(K_{X_i'} + B_i' + M_i') + (1-\beta)M_i' - s_i L_i'$$

is big, hence there is

$$0 \leq P_i' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} -(K_{X_i'} + B_i' + s_i L_i' + \beta M_i').$$

Now $(X_i', B_i' + s_i L_i' + P_i' + \beta M_i')$ is not generalised klt, so $(X_i', B_i' + \beta M_i')$ is non-exceptional. This is a contradiction.

□

7.12. **From bound on lc thresholds to boundedness of varieties.**

Proposition 7.13. *Let $d, m, v \in \mathbb{N}$ and let t_l be a sequence of positive real numbers. Assume Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension $\leq d-1$ and Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of projective varieties X such that*

- *X is a klt weak Fano variety of dimension d,*
- *K_X has an m-complement,*
- *$|-mK_X|$ defines a birational map,*
- *$\mathrm{vol}(-K_X) \leq v$, and*
- *for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $L \in |-lK_X|$, the pair $(X, t_l L)$ is klt.*

Then $\mathcal{P}$ is a bounded family.

Proof. Step 1. Let $X \in \mathcal{P}$. Taking a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorialisation we can assume X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Let $\phi\colon W \to X$ be a resolution so that $\phi^*(-mK_X) \sim A_W + R_W$ where A_W is base point free and R_W is the fixed part. We can assume A_W is a general member of $|A_W|$. Let A, R be the pushdowns of A_W, R_W. Since K_X has an m-complement and since A_W is general, $(X, B^+ := \frac{1}{m}A + \frac{1}{m}R)$ is lc, hence $K_X + B^+$ is also an m-complement. By Theorem 1.4, we can assume (X, B^+) is not klt. The idea is to construct another complement which is klt. Replacing m we can assume $m > 1$ so that we can assume A is not a component of $\lfloor B^+ \rfloor$.

Step 2. Let Σ_W be the sum of the exceptional divisors of ϕ and the support of the birational transform of $A + R$. Then by Lemma 2.30,

$$K_W + \Sigma_W + 2(2d+1)A_W$$

is big. Moreover its volume is bounded from above because the right hand side of

$$\mathrm{vol}(K_X + \Sigma + 2(2d+1)A) \leq \mathrm{vol}(K_X + A + R + 2(2d+1)A) \leq \mathrm{vol}(-(4d+3)mK_X)$$

is bounded from above where Σ is the pushdown of Σ_W. Therefore, (W, Σ_W) is log birationally bounded by [15, Lemmas 3.2 and 2.4.2(4)] as $\mathrm{vol}(A_W)$ is bounded. Thus as in Step 7 of the proof of Proposition 4.4, there is a log bounded family $\mathcal{Q}$ of log smooth pairs depending only on d, m, v such that, perhaps after replacing W with a higher resolution, there is $(\overline{W}, \Sigma_{\overline{W}}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and a birational morphism $\psi\colon W \to \overline{W}$ with $\Sigma_{\overline{W}} = \psi_* \Sigma_W$. Moreover, letting $A_{\overline{W}} = \psi_* A_W$ we can assume $A_W = \psi^* A_{\overline{W}}$. Also note that $A_{\overline{W}} \leq \Sigma_{\overline{W}}$, so $(\overline{W}, A_{\overline{W}})$

is log bounded. Thus since $A_{\overline{W}}$ is big, there is $l \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on the family $\mathcal{Q}$ such that $lA_{\overline{W}} \sim G_{\overline{W}}$ for some $G_{\overline{W}} \geq 0$ whose support contains $\Sigma_{\overline{W}}$.

Step 3. Let $K_{\overline{W}} + B^+_{\overline{W}}$ be the crepant pullback of $K_X + B^+$ to $\overline{W}$. Then $(\overline{W}, B^+_{\overline{W}})$ is sub-lc and $\operatorname{Supp} B^+_{\overline{W}} \subseteq \Sigma_{\overline{W}} \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} G_{\overline{W}}$. Let $G = \phi_*\psi^* G_{\overline{W}}$. By construction, $lA \sim G$, so $G + lR \in |-lmK_X|$. Thus, by assumption, $(X, t(G + lR))$ is klt where $t := t_{lm}$. In particular, this means the coefficients of $t(G + lR)$ belong to a fixed finite set depending only on t. Decreasing t we can assume it is rational and that $t < \frac{1}{lm}$.

Now if $(X, \frac{1}{lm}(G + lR))$ is lc, then we let $\Omega = \frac{1}{lm}(G + lR)$ and $n = lm$. But if it is not lc, then the pair $(X, t(G + lR))$ is strongly non-exceptional, hence by Lemma 6.9, there is n depending only on d, t such that there is $\Omega \geq t(G+lR)$ with (X, Ω) is lc and $n(K_X+\Omega) \sim 0$.

Step 4. Let

$$\Delta_{\overline{W}} := B^+_{\overline{W}} + \frac{t}{m} A_{\overline{W}} - \frac{t}{lm} G_{\overline{W}}$$

which satisfies $K_{\overline{W}} + \Delta_{\overline{W}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Since $A_{\overline{W}}$ is not a component of $\left\lfloor B^+_{\overline{W}} \right\rfloor$ and since $\operatorname{Supp} B^+_{\overline{W}} \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} G_{\overline{W}}$, there is $\epsilon > 0$ depending only on t, l, m such that $(\overline{W}, \Delta_{\overline{W}})$ is sub-ϵ-lc.

Let $K_X + \Delta$ be the crepant pullback of $K_{\overline{W}} + \Delta_{\overline{W}}$ to X. Then $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and (X, Δ) is sub-ϵ-lc. However,

$$\Delta = B^+ + \frac{t}{m} A - \frac{t}{lm} G$$

has negative coefficients, so we cannot apply Theorem 1.4 at this point.

Step 5. Let $\Theta = \frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{1}{2}\Omega$. Then

$$\Theta = \frac{1}{2} B^+ + \frac{t}{2m} A - \frac{t}{2lm} G + \frac{1}{2}\Omega \geq$$
$$\frac{1}{2} B^+ + \frac{t}{2m} A - \frac{t}{2lm} G + \frac{t}{2}(G + lR) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, (X, Θ) is $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$-lc, $K_X + \Theta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, and the coefficients of Θ belong to a fixed finite set depending only on t, l, m, n. Now apply Theorem 1.4.

□

7.14. **From complements to Theorem 1.10.**

Proposition 7.15. *Assume Theorem 1.9 holds in dimension $\leq d-1$ and Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d. Then Theorem 1.10 holds in dimension d.*

Proof. Step 1. Let $(X', B' + M')$ be as in Theorem 1.10 in dimension d. It is enough to show X' is bounded because then we can find a very ample Cartier divisor H' so that $-K_{X'} \cdot H'^{d-1}$ is bounded, hence $B' \cdot H'^{d-1}$ is bounded too as $B' \cdot H'^{d-1} \leq -K_{X'} \cdot H'^{d-1}$, and this implies (X', B') is log bounded. Taking a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorialisation we can assume X' is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. By Lemma 7.3, $(X', B' + M')$ is generalised ϵ-lc for some $\epsilon > 0$ depending only on $d, p, \mathfrak{R}$. In particular, the coefficients of B' belong to a finite set depending only on $d, p, \mathfrak{R}$ because 1 is the only accumulation point of $\mathfrak{R}$. Extending $\mathfrak{R}$ we can assume $B' \in \mathfrak{R}$.

Run an MMP on $-K_{X'}$ and let $\tilde{X}'$ be the resulting model which is a klt weak Fano. Then $K_{\tilde{X}'}$ has an n-complement for some n depending only on d by applying Lemma 7.5 if $\tilde{X}'$ is exceptional or by applying Lemma 6.10 otherwise. This implies $K_{X'}$ also has an n-complement $K_{X'} + C'$, by 6.1 (3). On the other hand, since $(X', B' + M')$ is generalised ϵ-lc

and $-(K_{X'}+B'+M')$ is semi-ample, $\tilde{X}'$ is ϵ-lc. Thus by Proposition 4.5, $|-mK_{\tilde{X}'}|$ defines a birational map for some m depending only on d,ϵ,n which in turn implies $|-mK_{X'}|$ also defines a birational map. Replacing both m and n by pmn, we can assume $m=n$ and that p divides m,n. Moreover, replacing ϕ and C' we can assume $C'=\frac{1}{m}A'+\frac{1}{m}R'$ where $\phi^*(-mK_{X'})\sim A+R$ with A base point free and R the fixed part.

Let $\Delta':=\frac{1}{2}B'+\frac{1}{2m}R'$ and let $N:=\frac{1}{2}M+\frac{1}{2m}A$. Then $(X',\Delta'+N')$ is generalised lc and $-(K_{X'}+\Delta'+N')$ is nef. Note that the coefficients of Δ' belong to a fixed finite set and $2pmN$ is Cartier.

Step 2. Assume $(X',\Delta'+N')$ is non-exceptional. Then by Lemma 6.10, $K_{X'}+\Delta'+N'$ has an l-complement $K_{X'}+\Delta'^{+}+N'$ for some l depending only on $d,p,m,\mathfrak{R}$ such that $G':=\Delta'^{+}-\Delta'\geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} lm(K_{X'}+B'+2G'+M') &\sim lm(K_{X'}+B'+2G'+M')+lm(K_{X'}+C')\\ &= lm(2K_{X'}+B'+M'+\frac{1}{m}R'+\frac{1}{m}A'+2G')\\ &= 2lm(K_{X'}+\Delta'+N'+G')=2lm(K_{X'}+\Delta'^{+}+N')\sim 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $B'^{+}=B'+2G'$. Since $(X',B'+M')$ is exceptional, $(X',B'^{+}+M')$ is generalised klt. Thus

$$(X',\frac{1}{2}B'^{+}+\frac{1}{2}\Delta'^{+}+\frac{1}{2}M'+\frac{1}{2}N')$$

is generalised klt, hence exceptional. Now replace B' with $\frac{1}{2}B'^{+}+\frac{1}{2}\Delta'^{+}$ and replace M with $\frac{1}{2}M+\frac{1}{2}N$. Replacing $p,\mathfrak{R}$ accordingly, we can then assume $K_{X'}+B'+M'\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$ and that M is big.

Step 3. Now assume $(X',\Delta'+N')$ is exceptional. By Lemma 7.7, there is a rational number $\beta\in(0,1)$ depending only on $d,p,m,\mathfrak{R}$ such that $(X',\Delta'+\beta N')$ is exceptional. Since $N=\frac{1}{2}M+\frac{1}{2m}A$ and A is base point free and big, there is $r\in\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$-r(K_{X'}+\Delta'+\beta N')=-r(K_{X'}+\Delta'+N')+r(1-\beta)N'$$

is integral and potentially birational where r depends only on $d,p,m,\beta,\mathfrak{R}$. Then

$$|K_{X'}-r(K_{X'}+\Delta'+\beta N')|$$

defines a birational map by [15, Lemma 2.3.4], hence

$$|mK_{X'}-rm(K_{X'}+\Delta'+\beta N')|$$

also defines a birational map which implies

$$|-rm(K_{X'}+\Delta'+\beta N')|=|mK_{X'}+mC'-rm(K_{X'}+\Delta'+\beta N')|$$

defines a birational map as well. In particular, there is $\Delta'^{+}\geq\Delta'$ such that

$$rm(K_{X'}+\Delta'^{+}+\beta N')\sim 0.$$

Since $(X',\Delta'+\beta N')$ is exceptional, $(X',\Delta'^{+}+\beta N')$ is generalised klt. Now replace B' and M with Δ'^{+} and βN, respectively. Replacing $p,\mathfrak{R}$ accordingly, from now on we can then assume $K_{X'}+B'+M'\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$ and that M is big.

Step 4. Let $\tilde{X}'$ be as in Step 1 which is the result of an MMP on $-K_{X'}$. Since $K_{X'}+B'+M'\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$, we can replace X' with $\tilde{X}'$, hence assume X' is a weak Fano. By Step 1, $K_{X'}$ has an m-complement and $|-mK_{X'}|$ defines a birational map. Moreover, by Lemma 7.9, $\mathrm{vol}(-K_{X'})\leq v$ for some number v depending only on $d,p,\mathfrak{R}$. On the other hand, by

Lemma 7.11, for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a positive real number t_l depending only on $d, p, l, \mathfrak{R}$ such that for any $L' \in |-lK_{X'}|$, the pair $(X', t_l L')$ is klt. Therefore, X' belongs to a bounded family by Proposition 7.13.

□

8. **Boundedness of relative complements**

In this section we treat Theorem 1.8 inductively. The results of Sections 6 and 7 rely on this theorem.

Lemma 8.1. *Assume Theorems 1.7 and 1.8 hold in dimension $d-1$. Then Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d for those (X, B) and $X \to Z$ such that*

- $B \in \mathfrak{R}$,
- (X, Γ) *is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial plt for some* Γ,
- $-(K_X + \Gamma)$ *is ample over* Z,
- $S := \lfloor \Gamma \rfloor$ *is irreducible and it is a component of* $\lfloor B \rfloor$, *and*
- S *intersects the fibre over* z.

Proof. First we claim that if T is the image of S in Z, then the induced morphism $S \to T$ is a contraction. Let f denote $X \to Z$ and let $\pi\colon V \to Z$ denote the finite part of the Stein factorisation of $S \to Z$. Then by the properties of Γ and Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing we have $R^1 f_* \mathcal{O}_X(-S) = 0$ which implies $f_*\mathcal{O}_X \to f_*\mathcal{O}_S$ is surjective, and this in turn implies $\mathcal{O}_Z \to \pi_*\mathcal{O}_V$ is surjective because $\mathcal{O}_Z = f_*\mathcal{O}_X$ and $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \pi_*\mathcal{O}_V$. Therefore, $V \to T$ is an isomorphism and $S \to T$ is a contraction.

Let $K_S + B_S = (K_X + B)|_S$ which is anti-nef over T. By Lemma 3.3, $B_S \in \Phi(\mathfrak{S})$ for some finite set $\mathfrak{S} \subset [0,1]$ of rational numbers depending only on $\mathfrak{R}$. Moreover, S is Fano type over T by restricting $K_X + \Gamma$ to S. Therefore, $K_S + B_S$ has an n-complement $K_S + B_S^+$ over z with $B_S^+ \geq B_S$, for some n divisible by $I(\mathfrak{S})$ and depending only on $d, \mathfrak{S}$: this follows from Theorem 1.7 in dimension $d-1$ if $\dim T = 0$ or from Theorem 1.8 in dimension $d-1$ if $\dim T > 0$. Replacing n we can assume it is divisible by $I(\mathfrak{R})$.

The idea is to lift the complement $K_S + B_S^+$ to an n-complement $K_X + B^+$ of $K_X + B$ over z with $B^+ \geq B$. This can be proved by closely following the proof of Proposition 6.7 using the right notation and by working over some open affine neighbourhood of z (and shrinking it if necessary). The inversion of adjunction and the connectedness principle required at the end of the proof are well-known in this setting [21][28, Theorem 17.4].

□

Proposition 8.2. *Assume Theorems 1.7 and 1.8 hold in dimension $d-1$. Then Theorem 1.8 holds in dimension d.*

Proof. When (X, B) is klt and $-(K_X + B)$ is nef and big over Z, the theorem is essentially [35, Theorem 3.1].

Step 1. Pick an effective Cartier divisor N on Z passing through z. Let t be the lc threshold of f^*N with respect to (X, B) over z. Let $\Omega = B + tf^*N$ and let (X', Ω') be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt model of (X, Ω). Then X' is Fano type over Z. There is $\Delta' \leq \Omega'$ such that $\Delta' \in \Phi(\mathfrak{R})$, some component of $\lfloor \Delta' \rfloor$ is vertical over Z intersecting the fibre over z, and $B \leq \Delta$ where Δ is the pushdown of Δ'. Run an MMP$/Z$ on $-(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ and let X'' be the resulting model. Since $-(K_{X'} + \Delta') = -(K_{X'} + \Omega') + (\Omega' - \Delta')$ is pseudo-effective over Z, the MMP ends with a minimal model, that is, $-(K_{X''} + \Delta'')$ is nef over Z. Moreover, if $K_{X''} + \Delta''$ has an n-complement $K_{X''} + \Delta''^+$ over z with $\Delta''^+ \geq \Delta''$, then $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ has an n-complement $K_{X'} + \Delta'^+$ over z with $\Delta'^+ \geq \Delta'$ which in turn implies $K_X + B$ also has

an n-complement $K_X + B^+$ over z with $B^+ \geq B$. Since $-(K_{X'} + \Omega')$ is semi-ample over Z, (X'', Ω'') is lc, hence (X'', Δ'') is lc. Replacing (X, B) with (X'', Δ'') we can assume $\lfloor B \rfloor$ has a component intersecting the fibre over z.

Step 2. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a sufficiently small number. Let Θ be the boundary whose coefficients are the same as B except that we replace each coefficient in $(1-\epsilon, 1)$ with 1. Run an MMP$/Z$ on $-(K_X + \Theta)$ and let X' be the resulting model. Arguing as in 2.33, one can show we can choose ϵ depending only on $d, \mathfrak{R}$ so that no component of $\lfloor \Theta \rfloor$ is contracted by the MMP, (X', Θ') is lc, and that $-(K_{X'} + \Theta')$ is nef over Z. Moreover, the coefficients of Θ' belong to some fixed finite set depending only on $\mathfrak{R}, \epsilon$. If $K_{X'} + \Theta'$ has an n-complement $K_{X'} + \Theta'^+$ over z with $\Theta'^+ \geq \Theta'$, then $K_X + \Theta$ has an n-complement $K_X + \Theta^+$ over z with $\Theta^+ \geq \Theta$ which in turn implies $K_X + B$ also has an n-complement $K_X + B^+$ over z with $B^+ \geq B$. Replacing (X, B) with (X', Θ') and extending $\mathfrak{R}$, from now on we can assume $B \in \mathfrak{R}$. In the following steps we try to mimic the arguments of the proof of Proposition 6.8.

Step 3. Since X is Fano type over Z, $-K_X$ is big over Z. So since $-(K_X + B)$ is nef over Z,

$$-(K_X + \alpha B) = -\alpha(K_X + B) - (1-\alpha)K_X$$

is big over Z for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We will assume α is sufficiently close to 1. Define a boundary Δ as follows. Let D be a prime divisor. If D is vertical over Z, let $\mu_D \Delta = \mu_D B$ but if D is horizontal over Z, let $\mu_D \Delta = \mu_D \alpha B$. Then (X, Δ) is lc, $\alpha B \leq \Delta \leq B$, $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor$ has a component intersecting the fibre over z, and $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is big over Z as $\Delta = \alpha B$ near the generic fibre.

Let $X \to V/Z$ be the contraction defined by $-(K_X + B)$. Run an MMP on $-(K_X + \Delta)$ over V and let X' be the resulting model. Perhaps after replacing α with a larger number, we can assume $-(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ is nef and big over Z. Replace (X, B) with (X', B') and replace Δ with Δ' so that we can assume $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is nef and big over Z. Let $X \to T/Z$ be the contraction defined by $-(K_X + \Delta)$.

Let $\tilde{\Delta} = \beta \Delta$ for some $\beta < 1$. After running an MMP on $-(K_X + \tilde{\Delta})$ over T we can assume $-(K_X + \tilde{\Delta})$ is nef and big over T, hence also nef and big over Z if we replace β with a number sufficiently close to 1. Taking a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt model of (X, B), increasing α, β if necessary, and replacing $K_X + \Delta$ and $K_X + \tilde{\Delta}$ with their pullbacks we can assume (X, B) is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial dlt and that there are boundaries $\tilde{\Delta} \leq \Delta \leq B$ so that $-(K_X + \Delta)$ and $-(K_X + \tilde{\Delta})$ are nef and big over Z, some component of $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor$ intersects the fibre over z, and that $(X, \tilde{\Delta})$ is klt.

Step 4. We can write $-(K_X + \Delta) \sim_{\mathbb{R}} A + G/Z$ where $A \geq 0$ is ample and $G \geq 0$. Assume $\operatorname{Supp} G$ does not contain any non-klt centre of (X, Δ). Let $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small. Since

$$-(K_X + \Delta + \delta G) \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (1-\delta)(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta} A + A + G)/Z$$

is ample over Z, by perturbing the coefficients of $\Delta + \delta G$ we can find a boundary Γ such that (X, Γ) is plt, $S := \lfloor \Gamma \rfloor \subseteq \lfloor B \rfloor$ is irreducible intersecting the fibre over z, and $-(K_X + \Gamma)$ is ample over Z. So we can apply Lemma 8.1.

Now assume $\operatorname{Supp} G$ contains some non-klt centre of (X, Δ). Let t be the lc threshold of $G + \Delta - \tilde{\Delta}$ with respect to $(X, \tilde{\Delta})$ over z. Replacing Δ we can assume $\Delta - \tilde{\Delta}$ is sufficiently small, hence t is sufficiently small too. Then letting $\Omega = \tilde{\Delta} + t(G + \Delta - \tilde{\Delta})$, any non-klt

centre of (X, Ω) is a non-klt centre of (X, Δ). By construction,

$$\begin{aligned} -(K_X + \Omega) &= -(K_X + \tilde{\Delta} + t(G + \Delta - \tilde{\Delta})) \\ &= -(K_X + \Delta) + \Delta - \tilde{\Delta} - t(G + \Delta - \tilde{\Delta})) \\ &\sim_{\mathbb{R}} A + G - tG + (1-t)(\Delta - \tilde{\Delta}) \\ &= (1-t)(\frac{t}{1-t}A + A + G + \Delta - \tilde{\Delta})/Z \end{aligned}$$

which implies $-(K_X + \Omega)$ is ample over Z because

$$-(K_X + \tilde{\Delta}) = -(K_X + \Delta) + \Delta - \tilde{\Delta} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} A + G + \Delta - \tilde{\Delta}/Z$$

is nef and big over Z.

Step 5. If $\lfloor \Omega \rfloor \neq 0$, then there is a component S of $\lfloor \Omega \rfloor \subseteq \lfloor B \rfloor$ and there is a boundary Γ so that (X, Γ) is plt, $S = \lfloor \Gamma \rfloor$ intersects the fibre over z, and $-(K_X + \Gamma)$ is ample over Z. So we can apply Lemma 8.1.

Now assume $\lfloor \Omega \rfloor = 0$. As in Step 6 of the proof of 6.8 we can assume there is a projective birational contraction $X' \to X$ from a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial variety such that it contracts only one divisor S' which intersects the fibre over z, (X', S') is plt, $-(K_{X'} + S')$ is ample over X, and if we denote the pullbacks of $K_X + \Omega$ and $K_X + \Delta$ by $K_{X'} + \Omega'$ and $K_{X'} + \Delta'$, then S' is a component of both $\lfloor \Omega' \rfloor$ and $\lfloor \Delta' \rfloor$. Now since $-(K_X + \Omega)$ is ample over Z, we can find a boundary Γ' so that (X', Γ') is plt, $S' = \lfloor \Gamma' \rfloor$ intersects the fibre over z, and $-(K_{X'} + \Gamma')$ is ample over Z. In addition, if $K_{X'} + B'$ is the pullback of $K_X + B$, then S' is a component of $\lfloor B' \rfloor$. Now apply Lemma 8.1 to .

□

9. **Anti-canonical volume**

In this section we prove Theorem 1.6 which claims that the anti-canonical volumes of ϵ-lc Fano varieties of a given dimension are bounded. Recall that we proved this boundedness for exceptional Fano varieties in 7.9. To deal with the non-exceptional case we need Conjecture 1.5 in lower dimension.

Proof. (of Theorem 1.6) *Step 1.* The birational boundedness claim follows from existence of v and Theorem 1.2, eg as in Step 7 of the proof of 4.4. If there is no v as in the statement, then there is a sequence X_i of ϵ-lc Fano varieties of dimension d such that $\mathrm{vol}(-K_{X_i})$ is an increasing sequence approaching ∞. We will derive a contradiction. Fix $\epsilon' \in (0, \epsilon)$. Then there exist a decreasing sequence of rational numbers a_i approaching 0, and $\mathbb{Q}$-boundaries $B_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -a_i K_{X_i}$ such that $(2d)^d < \mathrm{vol}(B_i)$ and (X_i, B_i) is ϵ'-lc but not ϵ''-lc for any $\epsilon'' > \epsilon'$. We can assume $a_i < 1$, hence $-(K_{X_i} + B_i)$ is ample. Thus for each i, there is a prime divisor D_i' on birational models of X_i such that $a(D_i', X_i, B_i) = \epsilon'$. If D_i' is a divisor on X_i, then we let $\phi_i \colon X_i' \to X_i$ to be a small $\mathbb{Q}$-factorialisation, otherwise we let it be a birational contraction which extracts only D_i' with X_i' being $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Let $K_{X_i'} + e_i D_i' = \phi_i^* K_{X_i}$ and let $K_{X_i'} + B_i' = \phi_i^*(K_{X_i} + B_i)$. Then $e_i \leq 1 - \epsilon$ but $\mu_{D_i} B_i' = 1 - \epsilon'$. Therefore, the coefficient of D_i' in $P_i' := \phi_i^* B_i = B_i' - e_i D_i'$ is at least $\epsilon - \epsilon'$.

Step 2. Let H_i be a general ample $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor so that $K_{X_i} + B_i + H_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and $(X_i, B_i + H_i)$ is ϵ'-lc, and let H_i' be its pullback to X_i'. Run an MMP on $-D_i'$ which ends with a Mori

fibre space X_i'' with Mori fibre structure $X_i'' \to Z_i$. Letting $b_i = \frac{1}{a_i} - 1$ we get $b_i B_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} H_i$ and the b_i form an increasing sequence approaching ∞. Now

$$K_{X_i''} + B_i'' + b_i P_i'' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_{X_i''} + B_i'' + H_i'' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$$

and $\mu_{D_i''} b_i P_i'' \geq b_i(\epsilon - \epsilon')$. So there is a number $s_i \geq b_i(\epsilon - \epsilon')$ so that $K_{X_i''} + s_i D_i'' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0/Z_i$. In particular, $\lim s_i = \infty$.

Assume $\dim Z_i > 0$ for every i and let V_i be a general fibre of $X_i'' \to Z_i$. Since we are assuming Conjecture 1.5 in dimension $\leq d-1$, V_i belongs to a bounded family as it is an ϵ'-lc Fano variety. Restricting to V_i we get $K_{V_i} + s_i D_{V_i} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ where $D_{V_i} = D_i''|_{V_i}$. This contradicts Lemma 2.11.

From now on we can assume $\dim Z_i = 0$ for every i. By construction,

$$\operatorname{vol}(-K_{X_i''}) \geq \operatorname{vol}(b_i P_i'') \geq \operatorname{vol}(b_i P_i') = \operatorname{vol}(b_i B_i) > (2b_i d)^d.$$

Replacing ϵ with ϵ' and replacing X_i with X_i' we can assume there is a prime divisor D_i on X_i such that $K_{X_i} + s_i D_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and that the s_i form an increasing sequence approaching ∞.

Step 3. In this step we fix i. By 2.16 (2), there is a bounded covering family of subvarieties of X_i such that for any pair of general closed points $x_i, y_i \in X_i$ there exist a member G_i of the family and a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $0 \leq \Delta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -a_i K_{X_i}$ so that (X_i, Δ_i) is lc at x_i with a unique non-klt place whose centre contains x_i, that centre is G_i, and (X_i, Δ_i) is not lc at y_i. As $-(K_{X_i} + \Delta_i)$ is ample, $\dim G_i \neq 0$ by the connectedness principle.

Let F_i be the normalisation of G_i, and let $F_i' \to F_i$ be a resolution so that $F_i' \dashrightarrow W_i$ is a morphism. By Theorem 3.9, there is a $\mathbb{Q}$-boundary Θ_{F_i} with coefficients in a fixed DCC set Φ depending only on d such that we can write

$$(K_{X_i} + \Delta_i)|_{F_i} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_{F_i} + \Delta_{F_i} := K_{F_i} + \Theta_{F_i} + P_{F_i}$$

where P_{F_i} is pseudo-effective. Increasing a_i and adding to Δ_i we can assume $P_i \geq 0$.

Let $D_{F_i} := D_i|_{F_i}$. By Lemma 3.10, each component of D_{F_i} has coefficient at least 1 in $\Theta_{F_i} + D_{F_i}$. Replacing Δ_i with $\Delta_i + D_i$ and replacing P_{F_i} with $P_{F_i} + D_{F_i}$, we can assume each component of $D_{F_i} := D_i|_{F_i}$ has coefficient at least 1 in Δ_{F_i}. Note that we also need to replace a_i with $a_i + \frac{1}{s_i}$ which we still can assume to form a decreasing sequence approaching 0.

Step 4. Pick a rational number $\epsilon' \in (0, \epsilon)$. By construction, (F_i, Δ_{F_i}) is not ϵ'-lc. Define a boundary $\Sigma_{F_i'}$ on F_i' as follows. Let S_i be a prime divisor and let v_i be its coefficient in $\Delta_{F_i'}$ where $K_{F_i'} + \Delta_{F_i'}$ is the pullback of $K_{F_i} + \Delta_{F_i}$. If $v_i \leq 0$, then let the coefficient of S_i in $\Sigma_{F_i'}$ be zero. But if $v_i > 0$, then let the coefficient of S_i in $\Sigma_{F_i'}$ be the minimum of v_i and $1 - \epsilon'$. Then we can write

$$\Sigma_{F_i'} = \Delta_{F_i'} + E_{F_i'} - N_{F_i'}$$

where $E_{F_i'}, N_{F_i'}$ are effective with no common components, $E_{F_i'}$ is exceptional$/F_i$, each component of $N_{F_i'}$ has coefficient $> 1 - \epsilon'$ in $\Delta_{F_i'}$, and $N_{F_i'} \neq 0$. Note that $(F_i', \Sigma_{F_i'})$ is ϵ'-lc.

Let $(F_i'', \Sigma_{F_i''})$ be a log minimal model of $(F_i', \Sigma_{F_i'})$ over F_i. By construction,

$$K_{F_i''} + \Sigma_{F_i''} = K_{F_i''} + \Delta_{F_i''} + E_{F_i''} - N_{F_i''} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} E_{F_i''} - N_{F_i''}/F_i.$$

So by the negativity lemma, $E_{F_i''} = 0$, hence $\Delta_{F_i''} = \Sigma_{F_i''} + N_{F_i''} \geq 0$. Moreover, $N_{F_i''} \neq 0$ because the birational transform of each component of D_{F_i} is a component of $N_{F_i''}$.

Let $H_{F_i''}$ be a general $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor so that $K_{F_i''} + \Delta_{F_i''} + H_{F_i''} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and $(F_i'', \Sigma_{F_i''} + H_{F_i''})$ is ϵ'-lc. Then

$$K_{F_i''} + \Sigma_{F_i''} + H_{F_i''} + N_{F_i''} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$$

and running an MMP on $K_{F_i''} + \Sigma_{F_i''} + H_{F_i''}$ we get a Mori fibre structure $\tilde{F}_i \to T_i$. As we are assuming Conjecture 1.5 in dimension $\leq d-1$, the general fibres of $\tilde{F}_i \to T_i$ are bounded because $K_{\tilde{F}_i}$ is ϵ'-lc and anti-ample over T_i.

Step 5. By Lemma 3.11, we can write $K_{F_i} + \Lambda_{F_i} = K_{X_i}|_{F_i}$ where (F_i, Λ_{F_i}) is sub-ϵ-lc and $\Delta_{F_i} - \Lambda_{F_i} \geq 0$. Let $K_{F_i'} + \Lambda_{F_i'}$ be the pullback of $K_{F_i} + \Lambda_{F_i}$. Then

$$\Delta_{F_i'} - \Lambda_{F_i'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \Delta_i|_{F_i'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} a_i s_i D_{F_i'}$$

where $D_{F_i'} := D_i|_{F_i'}$. On the other hand, by construction, $N_{\tilde{F}_i}$ is ample over T_i. Let $\tilde{C}_i$ be one of its components that is ample over T_i. Let C_i' on F_i' be the birational transform of $\tilde{C}_i$. Since C_i' is a component of $N_{F_i'}$, it is a component of $\Delta_{F_i'}$ with coefficient $> 1 - \epsilon'$ which in turn implies it is a component of $\Delta_{F_i'} - \Lambda_{F_i'}$ with coefficient $> \epsilon - \epsilon'$.

Let $r_i = s_i(1 - a_i)$. Then $K_{X_i} + \Delta_i + r_i D_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Thus $K_{F_i'} + \Delta_{F_i'} + r_i D_{F_i'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ which in turn gives

$$K_{F_i'} + \Delta_{F_i'} + \frac{r_i}{s_i a_i}(\Delta_{F_i'} - \Lambda_{F_i'}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$$

and then

$$K_{\tilde{F}_i} + \Delta_{\tilde{F}_i} + \frac{r_i}{s_i a_i}(\Delta_{\tilde{F}_i} - \Lambda_{\tilde{F}_i}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0.$$

But now $\tilde{C}_i$ is a component of $\frac{r_i}{s_i a_i}(\Delta_{\tilde{F}_i} - \Lambda_{\tilde{F}_i})$ whose coefficient is at least $\frac{r_i(\epsilon - \epsilon')}{s_i a_i}$ which approaches ∞ as i grows large. Restricting to the general fibres of $\tilde{F}_i \to T_i$ and applying Lemma 2.11 gives a contradiction.

□

10. **Proofs of main results**

Recall that we proved Theorem 1.4 in Section 5 and proved Theorem 1.6 in Section 9. We prove the other main results by induction so lets assume all the theorems in the introduction hold in dimension $d-1$. They can be verified easily in dimension 1.

Proof. (of Theorem 1.8) This follows from Theorems 1.7 and 1.8 in dimension $d-1$, and Proposition 8.2.

□

Proof. (of Theorem 1.3) This follows from Theorem 1.9 in dimension $\leq d-1$, Theorem 1.8 in dimension d, and Lemma 7.5.

□

Proof. (of Theorem 1.10) This follows from Theorem 1.9 in dimension $\leq d-1$, Theorem 1.8 in dimension d, and Proposition 7.15.

□

Proof. (of Theorem 1.9) This follows from Theorems 1.8 and 1.10 in dimension d, and Proposition 6.13.

□

Proof. (of Theorem 1.7) This is a special case of Theorem 1.9.

□

Proof. (of Theorem 1.1) This is a consequence of Theorem 1.7.

□

Proof. (of Theorem 1.2) This follows from Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 4.5. □

References

[1] F. Ambro; *The Adjunction Conjecture and its applications.* arXiv:math/9903060v3.
[2] F. Ambro; *The moduli b-divisor of an lc-trivial fibration.* Compos. Math. **141** (2005), no. 2, 385–403.
[3] V. Alexeev; *Boundedness and K^2 for log surfaces.* Internat. J. Math. **5** (1994), no. 6, 779–810.
[4] C. Birkar; *Singularities on the base of a Fano type fibration.* J. Reine Angew Math., to appear in print. Published online: DOI: 10.1515/crelle-2014-0033 (2014), 18 pages.
[5] C. Birkar, *Existence of log canonical flips and a special LMMP*, Pub. Math. IHES., **115** (2012), 325-368.
[6] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. Hacon and J. M^{c}Kernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 2, 405-468.
[7] C. Birkar and D-Q. Zhang; *Effectivity of Iitaka fibrations and pluricanonical systems of polarized pairs*, to appear in Pub. Math. IHES., arXiv:1410.0938v2.
[8] A. Borisov; *Boundedness of Fano threefolds with log-terminal singularities of given index.* J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **8** (2001), no. 2, 329–342.
[9] L. Borisov; *Singular toric Fano varieties.* Acad. Sci. USSR Sb. Math. **75** (1993), no. 1, 277283.
[10] O. Fujino, Y. Gongyo; *On the moduli b-divisors of lc-trivial fibrations.* To appear in Annales de l'Institut Fourier, arXiv:1210.5052v2.
[11] Y. Gongyo; *On the minimal model theory for dlt pairs of numerical log Kodaira dimension zero.* Math. Res. Lett. **18** (2011), no. 5, 991–1000
[12] C. Hacon and J. M^{c}Kernan, *Boundedness of pluricanonical maps of varieties of general type*, Invent. Math. **166** (2006), 1-25.
[13] C. Hacon and J. M^{c}Kernan, *On Shokurov's rational connectedness conjecture*, Duke Math. J. Volume **138**, Number 1 (2007), 119-136.
[14] C. D. Hacon, J. M^{c}Kernan and C. Xu, *ACC for log canonical thresholds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **180** (2014), no. 2, 523-571.
[15] C. D. Hacon, J. M^{c}Kernan and C. Xu, *On the birational automorphisms of varieties of general type*, Ann. of Math. (2) **177** (2013), no. 3, 1077-1111.
[16] C. D. Hacon and C. Xu; *Boundedness of log Calabi-Yau pairs of Fano type.* arXiv:1410.8187v1.
[17] R. Hartshorne; *Algebraic geometry.* Springer (1977).
[18] V. A. Iskovskikh and Yu. G. Prokhorov, *Fano varieties.* Algebraic geometry. V., Encyclopaedia Math. Sci., vol. 47, Springer, Berlin, 1999.
[19] C. Jiang, *On birational boundedness of Fano fibrations*, arXiv:1509.08722v1.
[20] C. Jiang, *Boundedness of anti-canonical volumes of singular log Fano threefolds*, arXiv:1411.6728v2.
[21] M. Kawakita; *Inversion of adjunction on log canonicity*, Invent. Math. **167** (2007), 129-133.
[22] Y. Kawamata; *Subadjunction of log canonical divisors, II*, Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), 893–899.
[23] Y. Kawamata, *On the length of an extremal rational curve*, Invent. Math. **105** (1991), no. 3, 609-611.
[24] Y. Kawamata; *Boundedness of* **Q**-*Fano threefolds.* Proceedings of the International Conference on Algebra, Part 3 (Novosibirsk, 1989), 439–445, Contemp. Math., 131, Part 3, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1992.
[25] Y. Kawamata; *Pluricanonical systems on minimal algebraic varieties.* Invent. Math.**79** (1985), 567-588.
[26] J. Kollár; *Singularities of pairs*, in Algebraic Geometry, Santa Cruz 1995, volume 62 of Proc. Symp. Pure Math Amer. Math. Soc. 1997, 221-286.
[27] J. Kollár; *Effective base point freeness.* Math. Annalen (1993), Volume **296**, Issue 1, pp 595-605.
[28] J. Kollár ét al., *Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds,* Astérisque No. **211** (1992).
[29] J. Kollár; Y. Miyaoka; S. Mori; *Rationally connectedness and boundedness of Fano manifolds.* J. Di. Geom. **36** (1992), 765-769.
[30] J. Kollár; Y. Miyaoka; S. Mori; H. Takagi; *Boundedness of canonical* **Q**-*Fano 3-folds.* Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **76** (2000), no. 5, 73–77.
[31] J. Kollár and S. Mori, Birational geometry of algebraic varieties, Cambridge Tracts in Math. **134**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.
[32] C-J. Lai; *Bounding the volumes of singular Fano threefolds.* To appear in Nagoya Math. Journal, arXiv:1204.2593v1.
[33] N. Nakayama; *Zariski decomposition and abundance.* MSJ Memoirs **14**, Tokyo (2004).

[34] Yu. Prokhorov, V.V. Shokurov; *Towards the second main theorem on complements.* J. Algebraic Geometry, **18** (2009) 151-199.
[35] Yu. Prokhorov; V.V. Shokurov; *The first fundamental Theorem on complements: from global to local.* (Russian) Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. **65** (2001), no. 6, 99–128; translation in Izv. Math. 65 (2001), no. 6, 1169–1196.
[36] V.V. Shokurov, *Log Adjunction: effectiveness and positivity.* arXiv:1308.5160.
[37] V.V. Shokurov; *Complements on surfaces.* Algebraic geometry, 10. J. Math. Sci. (New York) **102** (2000), no. 2, 3876–3932.
[38] V.V. Shokurov, 3-*fold log flips*, With an appendix by Yujiro Kawamata. Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math. **40** (1993), no. 1, 95–202.
[39] S. Takayama, *Pluricanonical systems on algebraic varieties of general type*, Invent. Math. **165** (2006), no. 3, 551-587.
[40] D-Q. Zhang, *Rational connectedness of log* $\mathbb{Q}$*-Fano varieties*, J. reine angew. Math. (2006), Issue **590**, Pages 131-142.

DPMMS, Centre for Mathematical Sciences
University of Cambridge,
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WB, UK
c.birkar@dpmms.cam.ac.uk